

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1913.

## HESIODEA.

### I

(*Catalogue*,<sup>1</sup> Fragments 7b and 245).

Two papyrus fragments (*Berlin Pap.* 7497 and *Oxyrh. Pap.* 421) treat of the ancestry and story of Bellerophon. The first has the beginnings of fifteen lines, and the other the endings of nineteen: both are assigned to the second century A.D.

The Berlin piece has been generally accepted as a scrap from the Hesiodic 'Catalogue of Women,' and this verdict seems just enough. But the other fragment has been treated with less consideration: Rzach, for example, relegates it to his class of 'dubia.' Yet I think there can be no manner of doubt but that Grenfell and Hunt were right in claiming Hesiodic origin for their papyrus. It is hard to see anything in it which is alien from the Hesiodic manner and style. Schubart and Wilamowitz have also pointed out that in both pieces Bellerophon's mother is the real subject of the poem, and that Athena plays some part in both.<sup>2</sup> Unless, then, the two fragments are incompatible with one another, probability is that both come from the same passage. I have tried to show that this is really the case by giving below the text of the papyri, with some restoration to show their presumed connection: the supplements, save in ll. 3-4, 12 (*init.*), 20-22, are mine; the exceptions will be found in Rzach's apparatus.

] Ποσε[ιδάων  
] . . λ' ὅν γ . .  
Εὐρυνόμη Νίσου θυγάτηρ Παν]διονίδα  
τὴν πᾶσαν τέχνην ἐδιδ]άξατο Παλλὰς Ἀθή[νη,  
μήδεά τ' ἰδμοσύνην τ' ἐπὶ· οἷ]δε γὰρ ἴσα θεοῖσι.  
θεσπεσίη δ' ὁδμή παρὰ εἵ]ματος ἀργυφέοιο  
δρυντο κινυμένης· βλεφάρων] δ' ἀπὸ εἶδος ἄητο.

5

<sup>1</sup> Rzach, *ed. min.* (Teubner), 1908.  
NO. IV. VOL. VII.

<sup>2</sup> *Berl. Klassikertexte*, v. 1, pp. 45-6.

following lines. Weil, however, recognized the possibility that this verse introduced the new race, though he does not seem to have been much drawn to this view. Yet surely it is the right one. When the scholiast talks of verses weakening the *élan* of the introduction to the Iron Age, he must be referring to some kind of introduction now lost. What can it have been? If l. 169 *b* dismisses the hero-race as Hesiod dismisses his other races above, is it not likely that l. 169 *c* follows the formula usual in introducing a new race (cf. ll. 127, 143, 157)? Perhaps we may read:

πεμπτόν δ' αὖτις ἔτ' ἄλλο etc.

If we read 169 *c-d* so, before 174-5, we get some such result as this: 'Zeus then made a fifth race, and I would I had never been of it.' The scholiast then might well say of 169 *c-d* that they took away τὸ ἐνθουσιαστικόν of the following lines. We might surmise that 169 *c-d* are only alternatives for 174-5.

If all this is right, we must next ask which is the more original of the two recensions. First let us weigh 172-3 against 169, *a-b*. Lines 172-3 themselves might well be spurious work as a mere patch-work of tags (cf. Σ 568, δ 229, *W. and D.* 237), were it not that (1) the interpolation would be extraordinarily clumsy in any text which already contained the Geneva lines, and (2) they heighten the picture of the happiness of the heroes, while the new lines have a purely negative effect in this regard. On the other hand, 169 sqq. may well be imitative: *τηλοῦ ἀπ' ἀθανάτων* is an obvious tag, and the second half verse may be after *Theog.* 71; 169 *a* might be inspired by *Theog.* 501-2. As for 169 *b*, it would be possible to argue that it is original because it falls into line with Hesiod's usual treatment of a departing race; or, conversely, that it was probably inserted (with the other verses in question) because an editor remembered Hesiod's usual practice and missed it here. Secondly, there are the rival lines 169 *c-d* and 174-5. Here the issue can hardly be doubtful: to exchange the latter with their abrupt and bitter force for the former would be to take brazen arms for golden. Surely here an editor with more academic than literary feeling has tried to force the Iron Age into the mould of the more malleable ages. If this is true for ll. 169 *c-d*—the latter does not call for discussion—it is almost certainly true for the preceding lines, and the Geneva papyrus gives us the less original, though certainly an ancient, version. At the same time ll. 172-3 are not above suspicion: may not the Heroic Age have ended at l. 171?

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.



## THE CANONICITY OF HOMER.

THE view of Homer which I have attempted to expound in articles recently contributed to this and other journals may be stated as follows: an individual, father of the children, first natural then spiritual, who bore his name and worshipped him, lived in Chios, of which island he was so much the glory that 'Chian' in the mouth of Simonides, himself a professional and an islander, means 'Homer.' He was not blind, like his disciple the Chian Cynaethus, but seeing: he selected, arranged, adorned and expanded two episodes in the stock of saga (whether continuous or already disposed in separate poems) which the colonists brought with them from Europe. His date is limited on the lower side by the activity of his descendants and imitators, the earliest of whom, Arctinus and Cynaethus, are discovered at the middle and towards the end of the eighth century. Homer's *floruit* will be given (i.) by adding to 744 B.C. the length of time necessary for so great an innovation as epos—if we presuppose saga, or epos on a large and human scale—if we presuppose earlier poems, to conquer the world, create a taste for more, and inspire epigoni to attempt the task: (ii.) by ascertaining the date of the stage of Ionic in which Homer wrote, i.e. the moment at which the digamma still made metre, and  $\tilde{a}$  was in partial process of becoming  $\eta$ . Neither criterion yields a definite period, but both agree well enough with the virtual coincidence of the Carian Herodotus with the calendar of Paros, 900 B.C. This testimony, as coming more or less from the East, may well be within the range of tradition.<sup>1</sup> The age of Homer, the events of his life, and the figment that he was the author of the Cycle, the *Hymns* and the other works passing under his name, were probably kept as *ἀπόρητα* by the Homeridae, if we see that even Herodotus doubts the ascription of the *Epigoni* and the *Cypria* on critical grounds, and in opposition to the received view. The dates given by later writers (in Tatian and Clement) owe their vagueness to the fact that many of them are expressed in terms of epochs themselves uncertain, the *Τρωικά* and the *Ἰωνικὴ ἀποικία*. Sosithius however and Euthymenes date him in figures and by reference to local magistrates or princes between 900 and 850. The lowest dates (temp. Gyges and Archilochus), which are grotesque, show the power of school, name and literary convention. As poems under Homer's name continued to be put out in Gyges' day (by Magnes) and in Archilochus' day (by Lesches) a fourth-century writer

<sup>1</sup> It is later for instance than many recorded dates of settlements.

like Theopompus inferred that Homer was then living, as Thucydides, if he were consistent, must have set him (as author of the *Hymn to Apollo*) in the latter part of the eighth century. Confusion also resulted from the ascription of the Margites (held by Plato and Aristotle) with its epodic measure.

If this was the time and place of the Homeric poems, works of the Master and his School, what was their subsequent fate? Putting aside phonetic change (which is automatic and unconscious), we may ask if they had any power of self-defence, and were in any sense of the word canonical? or were they at the mercy of the first comer? That they were at the first comer's mercy was, it is notorious, the opinion of the nineteenth century. Statistics compiled by sympathizers<sup>1</sup> show that 175 lines in Book VIII., 224 in Book VII., are admitted genuine. Reaction has come. It is recognized that most modern 'interpolations' rest on the deficient historical sense of the discoverer. Blass' book on the *Odyssey* (1904), Rothe's *Die Ilias als Dichtung* (1910), the recent *Homerische Probleme*, Part II., of Belzner, to which we may fairly add Miss Stawell's *Homer and the Iliad*, have revised the evidence and effected a return very nearly to the Alexandrian position of athetesis on a small scale. We still expect the *Odyssee als Dichtung* of Carl Rothe. The general question therefore may be left on one side, and in any case it is not the affair of an article.

The poems then are getting back to a state which commends them to reason. Still no one maintains their literal canonicity. To do so would be to underestimate the capacity of Alexandrians, who must be supposed to have had feeling for their own literature, and to neglect the positive evidence of MSS. and quotations as well as direct tradition.<sup>2</sup> It has seemed well to collect evidence on one point, the additions to the text of which we can trace the source. The Alexandrians, in the shape in which we have them, throw very little light upon the origin of the interpolations they detect. Too often they are content with a *τινές*. A certain number however of additions and neologisms can be traced; it will be found in particular that contemporary literature has at all periods influenced the Homeric text.<sup>3</sup>

#### HESIOD.

1. A 3 κεφαλὰς Ap. Rhod. for ψυχὰς (ψυχὰς A 55): Hes. fr. 90. 80, 1.
2. A 265 Θησεία τ' Αἰγείδην ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισι om. vulg. hab. *de al.* = Hes. *Scut.* 182. Not an 'Attic interpolation,' but an escape.
3. B 507 Ἀσκλην Zen. for Ἀρην. To provide a heroic existence for Hesiod's village (*O.D.* 640) and avoid the vanished Arne: the variant Τάρνη shews that difficulties were felt about it.
4. B 527 ὁ Ἰλῆος Zen. q L 19 R 1 U 1 al. for Ὀδῆος (and elsewhere): Ἰλέα Hes. fr. 116. 1 (with etymology Ἰλεων).

<sup>1</sup> Henning's *Homers Odyssey*, 1903, pp. 221, 259.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. the statement in schol. Pind. *Nem.* II. init. ἐπιφανέις δ' ἔγχεοντο οἱ περὶ Κόνιατον, οὓς φασὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν παλαιάτας ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν.

<sup>3</sup> I include all variants—readings of actual MSS., quotations, readings explicitly recorded by scholia and readings favoured by ancient scholars, without distinction.

5. B 562 νήσόν τ' Αἴγιναν quidam ap. Strab. 375, γρ. Bm 5 for οὔτ' ἔχον Αἴγιναν: = Hes. *fr.* 96. 7 (whence also Certamen 292).<sup>1</sup>
6. Π 151 Ἑριδανοῖο Bm 5 V 12 V 18 P 2 ss. for ὤκεανοῖο: = Hes. *Theog.* 338.
7. Σ 608a-d add. Ϝ 51: cf. Hes. *Scut.* 207 sqq.
8. T 496 εὐτροχάλφ ἐν ἄλωϊ Ϝ 9 *cel q* V 16 γρ. A N 4 for ἐνετιμένη: Hes. *O.D.* 599
9. Ψ 299 ἄφενον *h* for ἄφενος: ἄφενον Hes. *O.D.* 29.
10. Ω 45 ath. Ar.: = Hes. *O.D.* 318.
11. α 1 πολύκροτον quidam for πολύτροπον: Hes. *fr.* 94. 22.
12. α 352 αἰόντεσσι Longinus for ἀκουόντεσσι (elsewhere *i*): αἰε v.l. Hes. *O.D.* 213.
13. δ 389 μέτρα θαλάσσης *b j* L 4 for κελεύθου: Hes. *O.D.* 648.
14. ζ 106 ἀνὰ δρία Megaclides for γέγηθε: δρία pl. Hes. *O.D.* 530 (δρίος sing. ζ 353).
15. ζ 297 ἴχθαι Aristoph. for ἀφίχθαι: ἴκτο Hes. *Theog.* 481.
16. ι 146 ἐπέδρακεν *f* etc. for ἐσέδρακεν: ἐπιδέρκεται Hes. *Theog.* 760, *O.D.* 268 (as λ 16).
17. κ 84 κᾶοκνος U 6 Eust. for κᾶνπνος: Hes. *O.D.* 495.
18. λ 631 ἀριδείκετα τέκνα Hereas (the Megarian) for ἐρικνυδέα: the phrase Hes. *Theog.* 385.
19. ν 269 ζοφερή Ap. lex. L 4 γρ. for δνοφερή: ζοφ. first Hes. *Theog.* 814.
20. ρ 322 ἀπαμείρεται Plato for ἀποαίνυνται: Hes. *O.D.* 576, *Theog.* 801.
21. τ 517 μελεδῶνες *a e h k* for μελεδῶναι: μελεδῶνας Hes. *O.D.* 66 (h. Apoll. 532 Herm. 447).
22. χ 233 ἴσταο H 3 for ἴστασο vulg.: ἴστασο Hes. *Scut.* 449.

## CYCLE.

23. δ 248 δέκτη *ff* for δέκτη: schol. ὁ κυκλικὸς τὸ δέκτη ὀνοματικῶς ἀκούει [Lesches *Il. parv.* XI].
24. δ 285-9 ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος τοὺς ε' ἀθετεῖ. οὐκ ἐφέροντο σχεδὸν ἐν πάσαις. ὁ Ἀντικλος ἐκ τοῦ κύκλου schol. [Lesches *Il. parv.* X].

## HYMNS.

25. A 485 ἐξ ἁλὸς ἡπειρον δὲ θοῇ[ν ἀνὰ νῆ' ἐρύσαντο.  
486 ἵφου ἐπὶ ψαμάθ]φ παρ[ὰ δ' ἔρματα μακρὰ τάνυσσαν Ϝ 53  
instead of νῆα μὲν οὔγε μέλαιναν ἐπ' ἡπείροιο ἔρυσσαν  
ἵφου ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις ὑπὸ δ' ἔρματα κ.τ.λ.  
= h. Apoll. 505, 6. ψαμάθον is found in a few MSS. Hefermehl *Philol.* 1907, 192 sqq. thinks the hymn preserved the original text of the *Iliad*, but there is nothing to recommend the variant. Cf. Causer *Grundfragen*<sup>2</sup> 49.

<sup>1</sup> B 565 Εὐρύπυλος V 27 Certamen 296 for Εὐρύαλος is possibly from Hesiod. The corruption of Πηρεῖς B 766 into Πιερεῖς also may be due to Hesiod, who first locates the Muses there

(*O.D.* 1). Π 857 ἀδρόνητα for ἀνδρόνητα is uncertain: ἀδρόνη occurs Hes. *O.D.* 471, but ἀδρός first in Herodotus, ἀδρότης in Theophrastus.

26. B 484 'Ολυμπιάδες βαθύκολποι of the Muses Zen. for 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι. The epithet elsewhere in Homer is only of Trojan women (see scholl.); extended to nymphs it is found h. Dem. 5, Aphr. 257.

27. Ξ 259 μήτειρα β 26 Zen. Aristoph. for δμήτειρα : παμμήτειρα h. Hom. XXXI. of Gaia.

28. Σ 313 ἐπήνησαν . . . Πουλυδάμαντι δ' ἄρ' οὔτι Epaphroditus V 4 V 27 for τις: the same construction h. Hom. Merc. 457 according to Ruhnken's conjecture.

29. Σ 551 a καρποὶ Ἑλευσινίης Δημητέρος ἀγλαοδώρου quidam ap. schol. T Σ 483: both adjectives unhomeric, h. Dem. 54, 266.

30. Ψ 81 εὐηφενέων Aristoph. Rhian. for εὐηγενέων vulg.: εὐηγενής h. Aphr. 229 (Λ 427).

31. β 236 κακοφραδίῃσι quidam for κακορραφίῃσι : κακοφραδίῃσι h. Dem. 227.

32. δ 229 τόθι Theophrastus for τῇ: τόθι first in h. Pan. 25 (Mimnerm. Pind.)

33. η 13 πυρὰν ἔκαie γ for πῦρ ἀνέκαie: fort. h. Dem. 248, 287. πυρά is unhomeric. (The same variant Herod. II. 39.)

34. θ 193 βήματ' quidam J for τέρματ': βήματα first h. Herm. 222, 845.

35. ι 116 ἐλάχεια Zen. } for λάχεια : ἐλάχεια h. Apoll. 197 (ψ).

κ 509 ἐλάχεια f H 3 U 8 al. }

36. μ 311 ἥδυμος L4 Pal. for νήδυμος: h. Herm. 241, 449 (Alcman, Simon).

37. μ 398 ἐδώντες a b d l for ἐλάσαντες: ἐλάων h. Herm. 342.

38. σ 130 γῇ ἐκτρέφει Georgides for γαῖα τρέφει: ἐκτρέφειν med. h. Dem. 166, 221.

#### s. VI.

39. I 212 πυρὸς ἄνθος v.l. ap. Plut.: in Hom. as metaphor only of youth. κύματος δ. Alcman 26, of gold Theognis 452 (πυρὸς ἄνθος Proclus fr. 291).

40. Φ 351 κύπαιρον the πολιτικάι for κύπειρον: Alcman.

41. Φ 575 κυνυλαγμόν Zen. for κεν ὑλαγμόν: Stesich. fr. 85.

42. Ψ 102 συμπλατάγησεν minority, συμπατάγησεν majority: παταγεῖν first in Anacreon (συμπαταγεῖν only in Sext. Empir.).

43. μ 148 κατόπιν f for κατόπισθε: first in Theognis.

44. μ 394 τέρεα e f U 8 for τέραα: Alcman, Herod.

45. ξ 65 εὐμορφον Ar. for ἐπὶ ἔργον<sup>1</sup>: first in Sappho.

46. ρ 537 καταύεται c for κατάνεται: καταύσεις Alcman 89.

#### s. V.

47. B 748 . . . και δεκ . . . β 15 for δύο και εἴκοσι: Eur. I.A. 270

Αἰνιάνων δὲ δώδεκα στόλοι

ναῶν ἦσαν ὧν ἀναξ Γουενὺς ἦρχε.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Reading η οἱ for δι οἱ. I withdraw my previous suggestion.

<sup>2</sup> The variant is perhaps connected with the ed. of the younger Euripides, C.R. 1901, 347.

48. I 461 ὥς μὴ πατροφόνος μετ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν καλεοίμην: πατροφόνος first in Aeschylus (-ουεύς α 299 γ 307).

49. I 612 κινυρίζων Zen. for καὶ ἀχεύων: κινύρομαι Aeschylus.

50. K 275 πελλὸν Zopyrus for Παλλὰς: cited from Sophocles.

51. K 334 πελιοῖο Epimer. and E. M. for πολιοῖο: πελιός first in Hippocr.

52. K 484 φοινίσσето schol. Ar. Pac. for ἐρυθαίνετο: oracle ap. Herod., trag.

53. Λ 26 ἐλειχμῶντο Zen. for ὀρωρέχατο: first in Aristoph.<sup>1</sup>

54. M 435 ἀμεμφέα ap. Ar. for ἀεικέα: Pind. Aesch.

55. Ξ 398 ἰξοφόροισι Agathocles for ἰνφικόμοισι: Soph.

56. O 10 ἀπινύσκων Aristoph. for ἀπινύσσων: πινύσκω Simon. Aesch. (as ε 342).

57. O 21 α μύδρους quidam: Aesch. Herod. Hipp.

58. Π 234 Ἑλλοί quidam for Σελλοί: Pind.

59. Σ 485 ἐστεφάνωκε Ar. for ἐστεφάνωνται: active first in Pind.

60. T 87 ἡ ἱροπῶτις quidam for ἡεροφοῖτις: Aesch. fr. 447.

61. T 90 θεὸς διὰ πάντα τελευτᾷ quaedam for θεὸς διὰ: τελευτᾶν neut. in Pind.

62. Φ 11 νήχοντ' the politicae for ἔννεον: med. imperf. first in Soph.

63. Φ 259 δίκελλαν Heliodorus for μάκελλαν: Aesch. Soph.

64. Φ 347 ἐξαυαίνη Aristoph. for ἀγξηράνη: Herod.

65. Φ 424 ἐπερεισαμένη Dem. Ixion for ἐπείσεισαμένη: ἐπερίδεσθαι med. first in Eur.

66. X 93 ὀρέστερον politicae for ὀρέστερος: of humans first in Eur.

67. X 102 νύχθ' ὑπο λυγαίην E.M. for ὑπὸ τὴν δ' ὀλοήν: λυγαῖος Soph. Eur.

68. Ω 80 βυθόν g i q for βυσσόν: βυθός first in Aesch.

69. β 68 θέμδος h for θέμιστος (as O 87): θέμδος Aesch. P.V.

70. β 98 al. μεταμῶλια -μῶνια codd.: μεταμῶνιος sine var. (as from ἄνεμος) Pind. Simon.

71. β 152 ἔσσαντο<sup>2</sup> δ' ὀλεθρον Rhianus for ὀσσοντο: met. Pind. Soph. (γῆν), ἐπένυνσθαι met. Pind. Xen.

72. β 334 ἐπαυξήσειαν R7 Pal. m. 2 for ὀφέλλειεν: ἐπαυξάνω Emped. Thuc.

73. γ 9 ἔφθ' α for εὖθ': ἐφθός first in Herod.

74. γ 82 ἐκδήμος Aristoph. U 9 for οὐ δήμος: ἐκδημος Eur. Thuc. ἐκδημία Eur.

75. δ 232 φαρμακέων (em. Buttmann) for ἀνθρώπων: φαρμακεύς first in Soph.

76. η 35 διεκπερώσιν R9 for μέγ' ἐκπερώσιν: Aesch. Herod.

77. η 100 βουνῶν quidam for βωμῶν: Aesch. Herod.

78. θ 108 θαῦμα νέοντες α q Eust. for θανμανέοντες: νέω act.? Herod. v. 59 νησοῦντι Sophron.

<sup>1</sup> From an old variant in Homer?

<sup>2</sup> So we must read: *escaro* MSS. Rhianus extended the figurative use to abstracts: 'they

did on death,' i.e. the death-portending feathers fell upon them. This favours *λετήν* for *ὀλήν* in the same line.

79. θ 437 γάστριν for γάστρην *p*: Aristophanes.  
 80. κ 31 ἐπέλλαβε *ϑ 7 c ij* for ἐπήλυθε: Soph. Herod. Hipp. (and δ 793 ν 282 σ 88 ω 49).  
 81. κ 124 εἶροντες Aristoph. for πείροντες: active first in Pind.  
 82. λ 197 (ν 134 λ 372) ἐπέσπων *a l p q* for ἔπεσπον: Aesch. Herod.  
 83. λ 271 ἰοκάστην *k R io* for ἐπικάστην: Aesch. uv. (the name does not occur in Hes. Cycl. Pind.).  
 84. λ 526 κατὰ δούριον ἵππον Ἀχαιοί Ar. for ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες: δούριος Ar. Av. 1128 δούρειος Eur.  
 85. λ 539 σφοδελόν quidam for ἀσφοδελόν: Ar. fr. 674 Kock.  
 86. λ 580 εἰλκυσ(σ)ε *c e r* for ἤλκησε: Pind.  
 87. ν 293 δόλων ἄτερ quidam for δόλων ἄτ': ἄτερ postpositive trag.  
 88. ξ 24 εὐχροον *f i o L 5* for εὐχροός: εὐχροος first in Hipp.  
 89. ξ 522 εἰνυσθαι Aristoph. Rhian. for ἐννυσθαι: ἐπείνυσθαι Herod.  
 90. ξ 530 νάκος schol. Theocr. for νάκην: Simon. Pind. Herod.  
 91. π 331 ποτιπλείειν *e f i H 3 al.* for ἀποπλείειν: προσπλέω first in Herod.  
 92. ρ 32 καστρωννύσα *a d l q* for καστορνύσα: καταστρώννυμι first Herod.  
 93. ρ 286 ἀποπλῆσαι Clem. Alex. for ἀποκρίψαι: Herod.  
 94. σ 345 ἀτέλευτα *d l* for ἀτέλεστα: Aesch. Ag.  
 95. ν 16 ἀγαλλομένου Galen for ἀγαιομένου: Pind.  
 96. ν 23 πειθοί U 6 for πείση: πειθώ first Aesch.  
 97. χ 345 μετόπιν O for μετόπισθ': first Soph. Phil. 1189 cf. κατόπι μ 148.  
 98. χ 347 ὁμφάς Max. Tyr. for οἰμας: plural first in Pind.  
 99. χ 451 ἐπιστείχων *e g j* for ἐπισπέρχων: Pind. ἐπιστείλω α: ἐπιστέλλω Aesch. Herod.  
 100. ω 77 μίγμα *j Br H 3* for μίγδα: Anaxag. Emped.  
 101. ω 229 γραπτάς *d Ap. lex.* for ῥαπτάς: Achaeus, Eur.  
 102. ω 530 κραγῇ U 5 ss. for φωνῇ: κραυγή first Teleclid. Eur.

## s. IV.

103. Ξ 56 ἄρρατον for ἄρρηκτον: Plato.  
 104. β 421 εὐκραῖ *a P 2* for ἀκραῖ: εὐκραής Aristotle.  
 105. κ 124 σπαίροντες γρ. schol. J for πείροντες: σπαίρειν Aristotle.  
 106. λ 583 προσέκλυζε Sextus for προσέπλαζε: Xen., orac. ap. Aeschinem.  
 107. ν 14 ἄνδρα κατ' quidam for ἀνδρακάς: κατ' ἄνδρα Isocr. 271 A.  
 108. φ 146 μυχαίτατος *d f C P i* for οὔτατος: Ar. de Mundo 3. 10.

## ALEXANDRIAN.

109. Z 155 Ἑλληροφόντην Zen. (Eust. ad loc.) for Βελληροφόντην: ἔλλερρι Callim. fr. 434.  
 110. H 127 φανερὸς ἔστιν [ὁ Ζηνόδοτος] ἀνεγνωκὸς μειρόμενος, οἶον στερόμενος schol. A. for μ' εἰρόμενος. No present of this verb is found in Homer:

Zen. intended the verb of which *μείρονται* is found Nic. Ther. 402 'to lack, desire' (unless he read *μυρόμενος*).

111. Γ 338a *ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὅμοισιν βάλετ' ἀσπίδα περσανόεσσαν* Zen. sc. 'dry,' = *ἀζαλήν* H 239. *περσαίνω* is mostly Alexandrian.

112. Θ 441 *ἀμβώνεσσι* Diogenes for *ἀμβωμοῖσι*: Callimachus *Actia* 34 (*Ox. Pap.* 1011).

113. Λ 603 *ἐκίνησεν το[καρηνον]* B 39. *κάρηνον* sing. = *κεφαλή* is Alex. (not earlier than h. Hom. xxviii. 8): *λιντανε[οικον]*. *λιμπάνω* and compounds are Alex. in verse, cf. C.Q. 1908, p. 218.

114. Λ 756 *μέσφ'* Strabo (for *ῥφρ'*): with verb, Alex. (τ 223 ω 310).

115. Π 642 *ἐνγλαγέας* Ath. for *περιγλαγέας*: Nic. Ther. 617.

ib. *πολυγλαγέας* Ap. lex.: Aratus 1000.

115. Τ 87 *ἐιραποῶτις* quidam for *ἡεροφοῖτις*: *εἶαρ* 'blood' Alex.

116. Τ 421 *κέχυτο χλοός* B 9 h U 10 V 16: *χλοός* Ap. Rh. ii. 1216 Nic. Al. 583 etc.

117. Φ 252 *ῥμματ'* Philetas for *οἷματ'*: perh. Alex. cl. *ῥσσε ἄνακτος* v.l. Λ 610.

118. Χ 325 *λευκανίην* for *λανκ-*: *λευκανίη* Ap. Rh. iv. 18, Nic. Alex. 131.

119. Ψ 420 *ῥωγμός* L 2 N 4 corr. Ap. lex. Herodian for *ῥωχμός*: *ῥωγμός* Bion fr. 15.

120. δ 1 *καιεάεσσαν* Zen. for *κητώεσσαν*: *καιεάεντος ἀπ' Εὐρώταο* Callim. fr. 224, cf. B 581.

121. ε 72 *σίον* Ptol. Euerg. L 5 schol. Theocr. v. 125 (*σία*) for *ῖου*: *σίον* Theocr. v. 125.

122. ε 281 *ἐρινόν* Ar. M3 R6 for *ῖνόν*: *ἐρινόν* Theophr. *ἐρινός* q R2: *ἐρινός* Nic. Al. 319.

123. ε 481 *ἐπαμοιβαδόν* Herod. for *ἐπαμοιβαδής*: *ἀμοιβαδόν* Ap. Rhod., Tim. Locr.

124. ζ 45 *ἀναδέδρομεν* Aristotle for *ἐπιδέδρομεν*: *ἀνατρέχειν ἔρευθος* Call. Lav. Pall. 27.

125. η 197 *κατακλώθεσθε* R 14 for *κατὰ κλώθές τε, κατακλώθησι* Eust.: *κατακλώθεσθαι* Lycophron 145.

126. λ 16 *ἐπιλάμπεται* Strabo for *καταδέρεται*: med. Ap. Rh. ii. 290.

127. μ 252 *δείλατα* Callistratus for *εἶδατα*: *δεῖλαρ* Callim. fr. 458.

128. ν 346 *μανόφυλλος* Zen. for *τανύφυλλος*: Theophr. *H. P.* viii. 6. 3.

129. ξ 12 *μελάνδρυνον* Crates for *μέλαν δρυνός*: Theophr. *H. P.* i. 6. 2.

130. ξ 407 *ἔνδοι* U2 for *ἐνδον*: Theocr. xv. 1, 55, 77.

131. ξ 530 *ὀριτρόφον* schol. Theocr. for *εὐτρέφης*: *ὀριτρέφης* Ap. Rhod. *ὀρίτροφος* Babr. Oppian.

132. ο 506 *ἐπιδόρπιον* P3 for *ὀδοιπόριον*: Theocr. Nicander.

133. π 403 *τομούροι* recentiores pro *θέμιστες*: *τόμουρε* Lycophr. Perhaps from a Thesprotian source.<sup>1</sup>

134. ρ 221 *φλίψεται* *adflēv* H 3 for *θλίψεται*: Theocr. xv. 76.

<sup>1</sup> See C.R., Sept. 1913.

135. ρ 231 ἀμφικαρή Ptol. Ascal. γρ. H 3 for ἀμφὶ κάρη: Nic. Ther. 812.  
 136. σ 79 βουκάμει quidam for βουγιάμει: Theocr. Nic.  
 137. σ 256 ἐπέγγχευεν a d for ἐπέσσειεν: Nic. ap. Ath. 372 F (τ 129).  
 138. τ 72 οὐ λιπόω o Mon. γρ. U 5 for δὴ ῥυπόω: Callim.  
 139. φ 306 ἐπητέως Ar. for ἐπητύος: ἐπητέες Ar. Rh. ii. 987.  
 140. ψ 193 λιθάκεσσι b c d f h for λιθάδεσσι: subs. first Arat. Nic.  
 141. ω 227 ῥυπόοντα g for ῥυπόοντα: Nic. Alex.

## LATER THAN S. IV. B.C.

142. I 212 ἐμαρήνατο quidam for ἐκάη (ἐμαραίνετο Ψ 228): Kaibel epigr. 478. 5 (s. ii. p. Chr.).  
 143. I 571 ιεροφοῖτις i m for ἡεροφ-: ιεροφοιτᾶν Ptol. *Tetrabibl.* 158. 20.  
 144. Δ 809 ἀντεμόλησεν ϖ 7, cf. Ap. lex.: μολοῦντες, etc. Byzant.  
 145. T 307 πάντεσσιν for Τρώεσσιν Strabo, scholl.: ? in the Roman Interest. (Homer a Roman acc. to Aristodemus *Vit.* vi.)  
 146. Φ 271 ὑπέριπτε h Mc U10 V10 for ὑπέρεπτε: ὑπορρίπτω Plutarch.  
 147. {Ψ 300 ἰχανώσαν ϖ 9 A D for ἰσχ-: ἰχανᾶν Babr. 77. 2.  
 147. {θ 288 ἰχανών j (Hesych).  
 148. α 329α ξέ ποσιν ἐμβεβαυία τριδάκτυλος ἐξεφαάνθη: Julian *fr.* 4.  
 149. ζ 201 διερός Callistratus P6ss. for διερός: Kaibel epigr. gr. 153. 2. ?  
 150. κ 87 ἀκλυτον Megaclicles for κλυτόν: Kaibel epigr. gr. 1046. 91 (? s. ii. p. C.).  
 151. κ 515 ἐριμύκων for ἐριδούπων (ποταμῶν) γρ. U5: only of cows, Hom.: δολυνγή Anth. Pal. vi. 219.  
 152. λ 98 ἐγκατέθηξ' o for ἐγκατέπηξ': καταθήγω Anth. Pal. vi. 103.  
 153. λ 134 ξξαλος P 3 Herodian Eust. for ἐξ ἁλός: Polyb. (ψ 281).  
 154. λ 245 παρθενικὴν ζωνήν d e h Plut. vit. Hom. Hermog. for παρθε-  
 νίην: παρθενικός adj. first Plutarch.  
 155. λ 475 ἀδρανέες γρ. T for ἀφραδέες: Plutarch, Anthol. Babr.  
 156. μ 259 ἐξαλειίνων h L 4 for ἐξερεείνων: Oppian v. 508.  
 157. ν 183 πολύμηκες H<sup>1</sup> γρ. R 7 for περίμηκες: Synesius 73 D.  
 158. ο 451 ὁμοτροχώντα Eust. for ἀματρ.: Manetho vi. 527.  
 159. π 165 θριγκιον γρ. U 5 for τειχίον: Lucian, Appian.  
 160. π 357 κιχῆσαι g for κιχῆναι: ἐκίχισα Oppian, Musaeus.  
 161. ρ 267 θριγγοῖσι d CL 5 OPI for θριγκοῖσι: Plutarch.  
 162. σ 57 ἀτασθαλέων h for ἀτασθάλλων: Nonnus.  
 163. τ 319 εὐθαλπιών U2 Eust. for εὐ θαλπ.: εὐθαλπής Quintus.  
 164. υ 302 σαρδόνιον vulg. for σαρδάνιον: -όνιον sol. first in Polyb. uv.  
 165. φ 6 ἐπικαμπέα Mon. for εὐκαμπέα: Plutarch, Lucian.  
 166. ψ 14 παρέβλαψαν a j Eust. for περ ἔβλ.: Galen, Xen. Ephes.  
 167. φ 93 ἀνωος P 3 for ἄνω: poeta ap. Suid. in v.  
 168. ω 276 διπλωίδας U 8 γρ. K Eust. for ἀπλοίδας: διπλοῖς Anth. Pal.  
 vii. 65.  
 169. ω 507 ἐρισταί f L 5 for ἄριστοι: Aquila *Ezech.* 44. 6.



Influence appears to have been exerted on the Homeric text by contemporary literature at all periods, from the eighth century, era of late epos, to the Hellenistic and even the Roman age. This is certain. The proportions unfortunately cannot be accepted literally, owing to the defects of our evidence. Of the sources enumerated above only the Homeric *Hymns* are complete (or complete save for the *Hymn to Dionysus*): their influence therefore is represented at its maximum. Of Hesiod a considerable mass exists, but still only a fraction of the whole corpus, and it is plain that the figure 22 is far below the real mark, especially as we see that several long-known variants have been identified with Hesiod by recently discovered papyri. The Cycle barely exists; and greatly as the influence of the Cycle on Homer has been exaggerated by critics in general, many more coincidences would be obvious if we had the *Cypria* or the *Aethiopis*. On the other hand, the influence of the fifth century, where we possess Herodotus and Thucydides entire, a good deal of Pindar, eleven comedies and thirty-three tragedies, is relatively exaggerated. This is probably at its maximum, given the stylistic uniformity of tragedy. Alexandria is much in the case of Hesiod. We possess Apollonius, Theocritus, and Nicander, but we miss Euphorion and the greater part of Callimachus. It would appear on the whole that the two most important influences exercised on the Homeric text were the Hesiodic and the Alexandrian, the eighth-seventh century and third-second respectively. The latter was augmented by the circumstance that the grammarians were themselves in some cases poets; but the modernization which the Alexandrian verbal alterations show is not to their credit as linguists.

The nature of the influence varied with the century. Lines were added in the period of Hesiod (5) and the Cycle (5); and this agrees with the tradition about Cynaethus (p. 2, n. 2). Important changes of sense also are found at this time; 'Ηριδανοῖο (no. 6, an anachronism), 'Ασκλην (no. 2), Δέκτη for δέκτη (no. 23), 'Ελευσινίης (no. 29, another anachronism). The variants which can be traced to sixth and fifth century usage, on the other hand, are slight, and consist in the introduction of new forms (κατόπιν no. 43, πατροφόνος no. 48, ἀπινύσκω no. 56, ἰοκάστην no. 83, σφοδερόν no. 85) or uses of words (ἄνθος no. 39, τελευτᾶν neut. no. 61, στεφανοῦν act. no. 59, ἔσσαντο with abstr. no. 71), or new words (πελλόν no. 50, πελιόν no. 51, μύδρος no. 57, δίκελλα no. 59). The influence of Alexandria though the same in kind was bolder: e.g. words: 'Ελληροφόντην no. 110, ἀμβιώνεσσι no. 112, εἰαροπῶτις no. 115, καιετέεσαν no. 120; usages and forms: μέσφ' no. 114, φλίψεται no. 135, ῥυπόμεντα no. 142.

Three lines are ascribed to this period: nos. 109 and 113. What may be called material variants are σίου no. 121, μελάνδρουν no. 130, τομοῦροι no. 134. The variants of the later periods are almost exclusively modernistic, and tend to introduce current usage and language. The only 'important' change is perhaps πάντεσσι no. 146. Given the vast loss of literature between 750 and 500, it seems probable that the most important as well as the most numerous

alterations in the Homeric text date from 750 to 600: this period is that of the late epic poets, the great rhapsodes, and the Homeridae, people engaged in reciting and composing epos. It is natural that these people should have introduced touches from their works into their recitations. The effect of these dealings, that is to say the success with which the various centuries affected Homer, can hardly be safely existimated from our scanty evidence.

The figures yield:

	Total.	In Text.	Per Cent.
Hesiod ... ..	22	12	= 55
Cycle ... ..	2	2	= 100 (!)
s. VI. ... ..	14	6	= 45
s. V. ... ..	69	23	= 33
s. IV. ... ..	6	2	= 33
Alex. ... ..	34	11	= 33
Later ... ..	28	17	= 55

Some cautious extensions may be made of this evidence. As it appears that additions of a line or lines occur principally in the postepic period, the unappropriated line  $\mu$  133a  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\gamma\eta\eta\tau\eta$   $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$  may be given to Hesiod. A 423 the variant  $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\text{Μένωνας Αἰθιοπῆας}$  (τινὲς scholl. A T, ἄλλο, Eust.) for  $\mu\epsilon\tau'$   $\alpha\mu\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$  wears the air of age, and is perhaps an escape from the *Aethiopsis*. A tribe Memnones (-eis) is registered in the neighbourhood of Meroe by Pliny, Ptolemy, Agathemerus and the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, and a meaning is given to it by Alexander Polyhistor ap. Steph. Byz. Mr. F. L. Griffith tells me there is no monumental evidence.<sup>1</sup> I 140 a  $\tau\eta\nu$   $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$   $\alpha\pi'$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$   $\epsilon\gamma\omega$   $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$   $\xi\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\upsilon}$   $\text{Μενέλῳ}$  was inserted by someone who knew the post-homeric loves of Achilles and Helen at Leuce, and wished to mark their posthomeric character: N 433 a b c were intended to qualify the statement that Alcathous was  $\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\epsilon\nu\iota$   $\text{Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ}$ . The wording  $\pi\rho\iota\nu$   $\text{'Αντηνορίδας}$   $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$   $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$  suggests the early part of the *Cypria*. T 30 a b c  $\omicron\upsilon$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\iota$   $\mu\omicron\iota\rho'$   $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$   $\epsilon\tau\iota$   $\zeta\omega\upsilon$   $\text{'Αχιλλῆος}$  |  $\text{'Ιλίου}$   $\epsilon\kappa\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\epsilon\upsilon$   $\nu\alpha\iota\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$   $\pi\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\theta\rho\omicron\nu$  |  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\epsilon\iota$   $\delta\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\iota\varsigma$   $\text{'Επειού}$ , for which schol. T gives no source, certainly comes from the Cycle, from the *Cypria* or the early part of the *Aethiopsis*. Philetas'  $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  (=  $\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$ ) in the sense of 'eyes' for  $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  B 269 may be Alexandrian; there is no evidence. The same remark applies to Zenodotus'  $\tau\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  B 314.

These are the additions to and alterations in the text which our evidence proves. There were many more of them, naturally, given the scantiness of our sources, but of the same sort and extent. They are in substance what the Alexandrians detected and marked by their athetesis; and it appears as though criticism will have to content itself eventually with Alexandrian limitations. One case in which the librarians of Alexandria were clearly right is the class of what may be called detachable supplements, *tibicines* inserted to stay the text, but which the text can do without. These are largely similes or

<sup>1</sup> There are other testimonies for Egyptian participation in the siege of Troy: e.g., Demetrius  $\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\eta$   $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$   $\tau\omega\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\tau'$   $\text{Αἰγυπτῶν}$  (F.H.G. IV. 383), how

the Ethiopians going to Troy under Tithonus when they heard of Memnon's death cast down their crowns at Abydos.

quasi-j  
cases a

A 80  
Γ 108

Δ 320  
Ω 45

γ 231  
ι 34

ο 74-

Σ

Ι

were m  
it beca  
the pr  
questi  
than ti

A  
scholia  
(with  
passag  
charac  
langua  
admitt  
inform

suitors  
in the  
enable  
forecas  
did th  
ship o  
of Uly  
(in the

<sup>1</sup> I qu  
rock of  
which d

δ 293

ρ 365

quasi-proverbs. I give a list of such as Alexandrian *flair* detected: in most cases an external source cannot be found.

A 80	κρείσσων γὰρ βασιλεὺς ὅτε χῶσεται ἀνδρὶ χέρηι	ath. Zen.
Γ 108	αἰεὶ δ' ὀπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν φρένες ἡρέθονται· οἷς δ' ὁ γέρον μετέησιν, ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω λεύσσει ὅπως ὄχ' ἄριστα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι γενήται.	ath. Ar.
Δ 320	ἀλλ' οὕτως ἅμα πάντα θεοὶ δόσαν ἀνθρώποισι.	ath. Ar.
Ω 45	[οὐδέ οἱ αἰδῶς] γίγνεται ἦτ' ἀνδρας μέγα σίνεται ἥδ' ὀνύησι.	ath. Ar. (= Hes. O.D. 318)
γ 231	ρεῖα θεός γ' ἐθέλων καὶ τηλόθεν ἄνδρα σάωσαι.	om. Zen.
ι 34	ὥς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἦς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκῆων γίγνεται εἴπερ καὶ τις ἀπόπροθι πῖονα οἶκον γαίῃ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ ναίει ἀπάνευθε τοκῆων	} brackets in M 4.
ο 74.	χρῆ ξείνον παρεόντα φιλεῖν ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν ἐν πολλοῖς οὐκ ἐφέρετο schol.	

Similes are athetized at Θ 557-8, Λ 548-557, X 199-201.<sup>1</sup>

I conclude with a passage which the Alexandrians marked as recent, but were not able, so far as tradition informs us, to assign to its origin. I notice it because Herr Belzner (*l.c.* II. 254) has neglected, unjustly I think, one of the principal traditional data (the contents of the *Telegonia*) which assist the question. These fragments of tradition are, I am afraid, much more reliable than the operation of our modern brains.

Aristophanes and Aristarchus athetized ψ 297 to the end of ω. As the scholia say *πέρας τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας τοῦτο* (*sc.* 296) *ποιοῦνται*. I cannot believe (with Belzner *l.c.*) that this statement means they athetized part only of the passage. What was Eustathius likely to know about their intentions? The character of ψ 297-ω has often been analyzed; I will say nothing about the language, metre or literary merit. In vv. 264-284, which the Alexandrines admitted, Ulysses gives a kind of forecast of the rest of his life. The reader is informed in general terms of what happened next; the arrangement with the suitors' parents, suggested in 117 sqq., is left to the imagination, but is implied in the fact of Ulysses having further adventures. Accordingly the poem is enabled to end at 296. In the *Iliad* the end of the war is more than once forecasted. Homer then contemplated ending at 296 and ended there. What did the supposititious botcher add? On this turns the question of the authorship of the assumed supplement. It contains (1) ψ 310-341 a recapitulation of Ulysses' adventures from the Cicones to the Phaeacians; (2) a recapitulation (in the mouth of Amphimedon) of the suitors' conduct during the absence of

<sup>1</sup> I quote two for their coincidence with that rock of offence *αὐτὸν γὰρ ἐφύλακται ἄνδρα σίδηρος*, which did not awake ancient suspicion:

δ 293 οὐδ' εἰ οἱ κραδίη γε σιδήρη ἐνδοθεν ἦεν  
om. d.

ρ 565 [μνηστῆρων] τῶν ἔβρι τε βίη τε σιδήρεον  
οὐρανὸν ἴκται om. δ ε ι γ H 3 Mon.

Beside these the Alexandrians detected grammatical supplements, intended to ease a construction or elucidate a meaning. I collected some C.R. 1902, 1 sqq. The origin of these passages in most cases escapes us; it is natural they should be personal invention.

Ulysses, and, 149 sqq., of Ulysses' adventures since his landing in Ithaca. Thus the whole *Odyssey*, immediately it has closed, is epitomized. Such an epitome is obviously useless where it stands; the reader of the twenty-three books does not desire a repetition of his vegetable, however excellent it be. It is equally obviously unhomeric. Homer nowhere epitomizes himself. He alludes constantly, and as part of his plan, to events outside his main action, but he does not resume or recapitulate that action.

But these passages may have been useful in another place, for example at the beginning of another poem, a poem which contained events later than the *μνηστορηφονία*, where the reader required to be posted up in the situation. These various *précis* would start the reader fair, as, on a larger scale, Homer himself orientates the reader of his *Odyssey* by devoting four books (α-δ) to the exposition of the situation in Ithaca and Greece generally at the moment when the action begins in ε. The diasceust of ψ, ω then took these retrospective passages from elsewhere, and tacked on to them the country scenes, τὰ ἐν Λαέρτῳ. Where did these passages originally stand? where did the diasceust find them? Not in the *Τηλεγονία* of Eugeammon, the most obvious candidate. The story is on too large a scale for that little poem of two books. Moreover the *Telegonia* began too late, with the burial of the Suitors and Ulysses' journey to Elis. An examination of the narrative may suggest another source.

The souls of the unburied suitors, guided by Hermes (ω 11)

παρ δ' ἴσαν Ὀκεανῷ τε ῥοὰς καὶ Λευκάδα πέτρην  
ἦδ' ἐπαρ' Ἑλίοιο πύλας καὶ δῆμον ὀνείρων  
ἦσαν, αἴψα δ' ἔκοντο κατ' ἀσφόδελον λειμῶνα,  
ἐνθα τε ναίουσι ψυχὰι εἰδῶλα καμόντων.

A landmark at sea near Ithaca known as the White Rock can be nothing but the south end of Dolichium, viz. Leucate or Ducato, soon to give its name to the whole island. So Strabo 452, Bérard *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée* II. 432 sqq.<sup>1</sup> It is a *point de repère*, like the indications γ 169 sqq., and means that the ghosts went north, across the sea and along the Albanian coast. In this direction, as Bérard pointed out, they could find no hell but the Thesprotian Acheron, to which Periander sent to call up Melissa. In Homer Ephyra (Cichyrus in later times) is the port for Dodona (α 259), and produces poisonous herbs (β 328). It was not till the Dorian period that it became a gate of hell. What the Gates of the Sun mean is not plain; but as the *δῆμος ὀνείρων* is already the underworld (*Aen.* VI. 283) it is probable that the terrestrial indications stop with line 11. Arrived there the shades experience a Thesprotian *νέκυια*, a rival to that in λ. The second *νέκυια* is inconsistent with the earlier.

<sup>1</sup> With Banbury and Vollgraff I am clear that Dolichium (Doullichium is only a metrical lengthening) is the later Leucas. See *J.H.S.* 1910, 304. It must be so till someone finds another island in these parts, capable of growing enough corn to trade in it and of raising a sufficient population to provide Meges with forty ships. The name Δολιχὴ belongs to a village on the south slope of Pindus, and hangs as an echo round one of the

Echinades. There is no reason why it should have meant 'long,' unless Port Isaac in Cornwall is to be connected with the patriarch. Strabo l.c. appears to have thought that the old name of Leucas was Νήπιος. He knew that Leucas and Cephalonia had changed their names, but no ancient imagined that Ithaca and Zacynthus were unoriginal.

Hon  
of a  
had  
that  
diffe  
buri  
larg  
that  
Aeth  
Had  
véku

cont  
the  
(whi  
seen  
Clem  
αὐτο  
Kupi  
state  
sour  
of M  
This  
whic  
birth  
We  
it m  
give  
Ulys  
Doli  
have  
Euge  
cont  
even  
the T  
Jeny  
and  
of ω  
have  
is tr  
Euge

1 T  
fr. 5)

Homer does not repeat himself in this way; there is no case of such a repetition of a motive once used. Again vv. 28, 29 suggest that Agamemnon and Achilles had not met before in Hades; but they are both there in λ. It seems therefore that the second *vékua* belongs to a different poem, which gave a slightly different account of these matters from the *Odyssey*. Now the death and burial of Achilles 36 sqq. belongs in subject to the *Aethiopsis*. But it seems too large in scale for the *Aethiopsis*, and cannot at all events be taken directly from that poem because in the *Aethiopsis* Agamemnon is alive, and also in the *Aethiopsis* Thetis spirits Achilles away to Leuce in the Euxine and he avoids Hades altogether. The 'unhomeric' touches noticed by the ancients in this *vékua*—the presence of Thetis and the Muses—are in Arctinus.

What poem would have opened with an epitome of the *Odyssey* and contained a Thesprotian *vékua*? One which was local, wished to celebrate the Thesprotian adit. to hell, and to tell the concluding part of Ulysses' life (which was principally taken up with Thesprotia). The *Telegonia* we have seen does not satisfy all the conditions. Another poem is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* VI. ii. 25. 1: speaking of plagiarisms he says αὐτοτελὴς τὰ ἑτέρων ὑφελόμενοι ὡς ἴδια ἐξήνεγκαν, καθάπερ Εὐγάμμων ὁ Κυρηναῖος ἐκ Μουσαίου τὸ περὶ Θεσπρωτῶν βιβλίον ὀλόκληρον. If we give this statement its lowest value, it implies that in Clement's day (or in that of his source,—I leave the matter open) there was a poem extant under the name of Musaeus which coincided with the *Telegonia* in the account of Thesprotia. This poem seems to be that which we require. It was apparently the same which Pausanias VIII. 12. 5 calls the *Θεσπρωτίς*, and which contained the birth of a daughter Ptoliporthe to Ulysses from Penelope (Kinkel *E.G.F.* 218).<sup>1</sup> We know nothing about its origin. As this coast was colonized from Corinth, it may belong to the school of Eumelus. It was evidently local, and tried to give Thesprotia the only heroic past open to it, namely its connection with Ulysses in his old age. It celebrated the local *νεκρομαντεῖον*, and alluded to Dolichium (by anticipation) by its Dorian name. Such a poem might well have begun with a *présis* of the *Odyssey*, to set the reader at his ease. As Eugammon is said to have appropriated the Thesprotian portion, so the continuer of the *Odyssey* may have conveyed the immediate sequel of the events in ψ, careless of the propriety of the epitome of the *Odyssey* and of the Thesprotian *vékua*. The country scene which follows I see no reason for denying to the Thesprotian or Corinthian poet. Though an imitator of Homer and his inferior, he may well have been capable of the realism and humour of ω. Lastly as we see that the *Telegonia* starts from where the *Odyssey* as we have it ends, i.e. from the end of ω, it would appear that Clement's statement is true, and that Musaeus was older both than the poet of ψ, ω and Eugammon; and this is natural enough if Eugammon was a Cyrenaean.

T. W. ALLEN.

<sup>1</sup> The *Ἀλκυωνίς* (Strabo 452, *E.G.F.* p. 77 its subject is too early for it to have included Ulysses' last days.

## DOES THE *ODYSSEY* IMITATE THE *ILIAD*?

IN Appendix II. to his edition of *Odyssey*, xiii.-xxiv., the late Dr. Monro examined the 'Relation of the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*.' One section of this Appendix, pp. 327 sqq., deals with 'passages of the *Iliad* borrowed or imitated in the *Odyssey*.' It is there admitted that repetition is a characteristic of the epic style, and that in many cases of parallelism no detrimental inference can legitimately be drawn. But if, it is said, 'we are able to point to a sufficient number of passages tending to show that the author of the *Odyssey* imitates the *Iliad*, and if no considerable instances can be produced of the converse,' then it is thought there is confirmation of the view that the *Odyssey* is the later poem. The object of the present paper is to suggest that the decisions in individual cases have been arrived at on scanty or disputable grounds, and without due regard to relevant epic practice; and consequently that the reasons for inferring the existence of a later poet imitating an earlier are inadequate.

The instances relied on are chosen from Dr. Karl Sittl's *Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee* (Munich, 1882), a work published at a time when the repetitions were in high favour as a means of discrediting passages and books, and of breaking the two epics into fragments. It was only one of a number of treatises, the authors of which came to the subject imbued with the belief that each epic was a congeries of lays, composed, patched, and joined together in different ages. They recognized, it is true, that an epic poet, like writers and singers in all early literatures, might repeat himself freely, and that caution was consequently necessary in coming to conclusions; but this very sound principle was generally honoured in the breach. It is not too much to say that the fashionable abuse of a prominent element in the Homeric style became a mania. I forbear to make this charge good by selecting from a collection of excesses and absurdities which might be presented from the multitude of works and essays concerned with the repetitions. It will be better to avoid exciting too much prejudice, and to allow the treatment of the instances now to be enumerated to be judged on its merits.

Dr. Monro, in his Appendix above referred to, has occasion to make two selections from Sittl's treatise. The first is of cases which Sittl regarded as proving that the author of the *Telemachy* has borrowed from the original *Odyssey*. Here Dr. Monro has no difficulty in showing that the demonstration

is a fa  
view t  
freque  
accept  
separa  
borrow  
is in a  
To be  
a  
'Αχιλλεύς  
in war  
the *Iliad*  
to poi  
The li  
handr  
the so  
fightin  
barter  
be nec  
of the  
chief  
a 398  
Foray  
at pea  
of war  
y  
in im  
μὲν γὰρ  
line is  
If it i  
three  
it has  
slight  
y  
in a st  
troops  
bodies  
to see  
lines l  
of 'he  
stance  
of νῆες  
Φ 542  
δ

is a failure. The other is of parallel passages which were sufficient in Sittl's view to prove that the *Odyssey* is later than the *Iliad*, inasmuch as they disclose frequent imitation by the *Odyssey*, and here Sittl's evidence and criteria are accepted without hesitation. The cases discussed are given below, and are separated into two categories—first, those which are believed to show mere borrowing or imitation; and secondly, those in which it is asserted that there is in addition an element of parody in the reproductions by the Odyssean poet. To begin with the former.

*a* 398, καὶ δμῶν οὓς μοι λήσσαντο διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς, and *Σ* 28, δμῶαί δ' ἄς Ἀχιλεὺς λήσσαντο Πάτροκλός τε. In the *Iliad* 'the phrase implies that capture in war was the chief or only mode of obtaining slaves. This may be true for the *Iliad*, but is certainly not true for the *Odyssey* (*a* 430, *ξ* 450).' This seems to point a contrast between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* which has no foundation. The line in *Σ* cannot fairly be interpreted as meaning more than that certain handmaidens of Achilles' establishment were captives of the spear. That in the society described in the *Iliad* the chief means of getting slaves was by fighting, may be admitted. But they could also be acquired by purchase or barter (like tripods and horses; Leaf on I 125, 407). That is clear, if proof be necessary, from H 475, *Φ* 40, 79, and the valuation in *Ψ* 795. And in spite of the instances in *a* 430, *ξ* 450, we may say of Odyssean days also that the chief way of getting slaves would be by capture. See Merry and Riddell on *a* 398 (one of the present pair of passages), referring to *ψ* 356 and *γ* 73. Forays were common, piracy was rife, and nations or tribes were not always at peace (*π* 426 sq.). Cp. *ο* 384, *ν* 49, *φ* 18. The times were 'troublesome times of war' (Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, 259).

*γ* 245, τρις γὰρ δὴ μὲν φασιν ἀνάξασθαι γένε' ἀνδρῶν, of Nestor, said to be in imitation and exaggeration of the well-known lines, A 250-2, τῷ δ' ἔδδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων ἐφθίαθ', . . . μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσαν. The line is a difficult one, and probably corrupt and ungenuine (M. and R., *a.l.*). If it is genuine, the exaggeration consists in saying that Nestor ruled men of three generations instead of merely lived among them. If there is imitation, it has been very badly done. But the ground for alleging it is of the very slightest. On the two passages see van Leeuwen, *Comment. Hom.*, 126 sq.

*γ* 291, ἔνθα διατμήξας τὰς μὲν Κρήτη ἐπέλασσαν, of the scattering of ships in a storm, said to be less 'natural' than *Φ* 3, ἔνθα διατμήξας τοὺς μὲν κ.τ.λ., of troops in the field. Why the verb, meaning (Leaf on *Φ* 3) 'severed into two bodies,' should be less appropriate of Zeus' action than of Achilles' is very hard to see. But Sittl detects a little rift. 'The reference of *τάς* to *νηυσί*, four lines back, is somewhat harsh.' That is surely hypercritical. The English use of 'her' or 'she' for a 'ship' would cause no difficulty in similar circumstances. In *ι* 78 *τάς* is used in the same way, though the nearest occurrence of *νηὺς* is six lines back. *τήν* in A 389 is a still worse case. See also *ο* in *Φ* 542, *τούς* in *μ* 243, and *ήν* in *ν* 81. There is nothing against *γ* 291.

*δ* 527, μνήσαιτο δὲ θουρίδος ἀλκῆς. 'This is almost a fixed formula in the



*Iliad*, imitated or borrowed in the *Odyssey*.' This seems to be only prejudiced assertion. So for

χ 73, ἀλλὰ μνησώμεθα χάρμης. 'The phrase occurs O 477, T 148. The word χάρμη is quite common in the *Iliad*'—naturally, and we do not expect it to be common in the *Odyssey*—' but does not occur in any other place in the *Odyssey*. It is evidently a reminiscence of the *Iliad*.' It is surely not fair criticism to object to the poet using stock phrases or formulae when he requires them.

δ 829, ἢ νῦν με προέηκε τὲν τάδε μολήσασθαι. It is only said here that 'the use of τάδε where we expect ταῦτα is suspicious; in the parallel Δ 201 τάδε refers to what follows.' On this point see Ebeling, s.v. ὅδε, III. B, where similar instances are given. *Facilius fit in oratione quam in narratione*. Editors do not remark on the use in δ, and the ground even for suspicion is of the smallest.

η 197, πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ αἶσα κατὰ Κλώθης τε (v.l. Κατακλώθης τε) βαρεῖαι γεινομένη νήσαντο λίνφ, ὅτε μιν τέκε μήτηρ, and T 127, τὰ πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ αἶσα γεινομένη ἐπένησε κ.τ.λ. 'The addition of the Κλώθης (or Κατακλώθης) to the simple αἶσα of the *Iliad* is surely later. It brings us within sight of Κλωθώ and her sister Fates in Hesiod.' For this see M. and R. (a.l.) on Κλώθης, and Lang (*Homer and his Age*, 229 sq.), who is prepared to show that 'the *Klōthes*, the spinning women who "spae" the fate of each new-born child, are not later, but, as less abstract, are if anything earlier than "the simple αἶσα of the *Iliad*."'

θ 258, ἐννέα πάντες ἀνέστην (= H 161). 'That there were nine champions of the Greeks is part of the story of the *Iliad* (H 161, Θ 266): but for the Phaeacian judges the number is arbitrary.' As to the *Iliad*, one need not refer to discussions that have taken place as to the number of warriors or γέροντες to be placed in the first class. It is enough to point out, as regards the references to H and Θ, that these do not by any means settle nine champions as part of the story of the *Iliad*. The nine are not the same on the two occasions. And as to Phaeacia, it is surely rash for us, in our ignorance, to predicate anything whatever about the number of the judges. But one remark may be ventured. It is well known that (to use Monro's own expression on ω 60) ἐννέα is 'a favourite number' in the epic. If the same poet had to hand a phrase once used, and it suited the new context, then his repetition of the *ipsissima verba* is just what a study of the Homeric economy in the use of phraseology leads us to expect. We have another instance of the same kind in ι 350, σὺ δὲ μαίνειαι οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς. 'In Θ 355 ὁ δὲ μαίνεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς is said of the furious career of a warrior in the field. It does not apply to the Cyclops.' Not if you insist that a verb shall always be used with precisely the same shade of meaning or application. But Ebeling divides the occurrences of μαίνομαι into two classes, and separates the two cases now under reference. The *Odyssean* phrase he classes with uses such as those in Θ 360, ἀλλὰ πατήρ οὐμός φρεσὶ μαίνεται οὐκ ἀγαθῆσι, or φ 298, where the Centaur's proceedings



are not unlike those of Polyphemus. Would the phrase used of the latter ever have attracted attention had it not been used before?

κ 162, τὸ δ' ἀντικρὺ δόρυ χάλκεον ἐξεπέρησε. 'In II 346 these words describe a spear passing through the neck of an antagonist. Sending a spear through the back of a stag would be an improbable feat.' Treating the question on its merits, opinions will, of course, differ. Mr. Andrew Lang, for instance, did not think the feat an improbable one (*op. cit.* 230). Expert opinion would be necessary to decide, for most of us are hardly in a position to judge. Few would believe that a javelin made wholly of wood could be hurled by a man with a force that would carry it through the human body at 60 yards distance (Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*, 72). It is dangerous to dogmatize. And two points may be added—first, the expression in question recurs also N 652, so it has some claim to be regarded as a formula. Secondly, if there is exaggeration in the *Odyssey*, it is only in keeping with the rest of the description. Odysseus is evidently proud of his feat, and does full justice to it in the telling. This case is discussed by Professor Scott in *Am. J. Phil.*, XXXII., 314 sq.—not to the disadvantage of the *Odyssey*.

ν 5, τῷ σ' οὐ τι παλιμπλαγχθέντα γ' οἶω ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν is 'hardly intelligible except as an imitation of A 59, νῦν ἄμμε παλιμπλαγχθέντας οἶω κ.τ.λ.' See also Dr. Monro's note *a.l.*, in which it seems to be assumed that ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν must mean 'return home' as in A. The explanation of Ameis-Hentze, which Monro does not refer to, is in every way preferable—that Alcinoüs is assuring Odysseus that he will not, on one of the wondrous Phaeacian ships manned by the famous Phaeacian sailors, be foiled in his journey home and compelled to return to Scheria (cf. ἐμὸν ποτὶ χαλκοβατὲς δῶ, 4), as had happened to him on his voyage from Aeolus' isle to Ithaca. See also their *Anhang*, referring to Faesi-Hinrichs, *a.l.* The hypothesis of an imitator—and bungler—is unnecessary.

ξ 156, ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Ἀίδαο πύλῃσι γίγνεται. 'In I 312, Achilles' splendid outburst, 'the verb is left unexpressed—to the advantage of the sense. In the *Odyssey* γίγνεται is a weak addition.' It may be, by comparison with the passage in the *Iliad*; but it is to be observed that it is quite common, in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alike, for γίγνεται to be, as here, initial in the line with a pause after it. There are nine other instances, excluding Ω 45. It is difficult, in face of them, to hold that the effect of the verb is so bad that an imitator must be inferred.

ξ 419, οἱ δ' ἔν εισήγον μάλα πύονα πεντάετηρον. 'From B 402, αὐτὰρ ὁ βούν ἱέρειον . . . πύονα πεντάετηρον. "Five years old" is right for an ox, but does not apply in the case of a pig, which at that age is too old for use'; and Pierron's note *a.l.* is quoted. *On mange les porcs même dès avant la fin de la première année; et ils ne sont guère bons que jusqu'à trois ans.* But all that Pierron infers is that 'Homer does not appear to have an exact idea of the nature of pork (or the pig).' Perhaps not. But does not the argument assume that the heroic taste in pork was the same as it is in modern France? The

reasoning appears to be rash, and the judgment of Paris can hardly be accepted as final here. Dietary ways—and digestions—in Achæan times were not as in these days. Meat was killed and eaten on the spot without any hanging,<sup>1</sup> and men then ate it *πρόπαν ἡμαρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα*. How are we then to say they did not like, or could not have stomached, five-year-old pork? See Seymour on the point, in *op. cit.* 222 sq. But it may be, as Pierron suggests, that the poet was not skilled in these matters. That is at least as simple as to assume two poets, one early and impeccable, the other late and given to spoiling everything *quod tetigit*.

ο 479, ἀντλῶ δ' ἐνδοῦπησε πεσοῦσ' ὡς κ.τ.λ. 'This seems an adaptation of the conventional δούπησεν δὲ πεσών.' That is possible, but very questionable; and it is a far cry from that to an imitating poet. ἐνδοῦπησα recurs in much the same sense in μ 443.

φ 125, τρὶς μὲν μιν πελέμειεν ἐρύσσεσθαι μενεαίνων, of stringing a bow—the bow; in φ 176, of tugging at a spear to pull it out of the ground. 'It can hardly be doubted that this latter use gives a better sense to πελέμειεν "shook" and ἐρύσσεσθαι "to pull to himself."' Again it is assumed that the verbs must be used in both passages in exactly the same significations, which is quite impossible, at least in the case of ἐρύω (see Ebeling, *s.v.*). But the critic's language seems much too strong. And this comparison of passages has its dangers. In the present case one might argue for imitation by the *Iliad*, on the ground that three attempts would be much more appropriate in the case of a stripling trying to string the great bow of Odysseus, than of a man only trying to pull a spear out of the ground, even if that spear were the great spear of Achilles.

φ 335, πατὴρ δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ γένος εὔχεται ἔμμεναι νίος. 'The origin of this pleonastic verse is to be found in Ξ 113, πατὴρ δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἐγὼ γένος εὔχομαι εἶναι. The words καὶ ἐγὼ had to be omitted, and νίος was put in to fill the place in the verse.' Here one may admit there is something to argue on. But the point is, is the expedient so heinous or the result so bad that a second poet must be inferred? Many think the line interpolated. Mr. Agar would change νίος to αὐτός, 'his own tale is.'

χ 233, παρ' ἐμ' ἵστασο. 'This phrase, which is almost conventional in the *Iliad* (Λ 314, P 179)—why not in the *Odyssey* also?—would imply that Ulysses was to leave his place and go to Athens: whereas the reverse is the case.' This seems unfair to the phrase in the *Odyssey*; for, so far as we are told, the same infirmity attaches to its use in both places in the *Iliad*. We cannot assume that the two heroes in either case were at a distance from each other. In all three cases a formula is used loosely; that is all.

χ 296, ἦριπε δὲ πρηνής. Both Sittl and Monro cite Naber's proof (*Q. H.*, 48 sqq.) that in the *Iliad* 'the rule is that those who are wounded in front fall

<sup>1</sup> A critic might learn some lessons from life in countries where old-world conditions still subsist. Sir A. Lyall quotes the following from the statement of a Bhil to a Border Court in India

regarding a foray: 'Two cows we roasted and ate on the spot, and the third we sold for a keg of liquor to wash down the flesh.'

backwa  
spear fi  
been ac  
brough  
In N 5  
In Π 4  
notices  
have fa  
incline  
(eis) μέ  
plete e  
pointed

Χ.  
μένων,  
K 483  
differen  
less th  
Ulysses  
ful: κ  
not su  
a swor  
not co  
living  
κράτω  
the rej  
the fa  
ἐγχεῖ  
is any  
Haym  
as par

Χ.  
expres  
stitute  
thus b  
object  
mere  
where  
seems  
not a  
except  
(op. ci  
P  
must  
not i

backwards and *vice versa*: except in M 396 sqq., where Sarpedon draws the spear from the wound, and the man falls with it.' But Naber's proof has been accepted too readily. If *all* the cases of wounding in the *Iliad* had been brought under review, the rule might not have been found to be so absolute. In N 545 sqq. a man is struck from behind, μεταστρεφθείς, but he falls ὑπτιος. In Π 413 another is wounded in front, but he falls πρηνής. Naber himself notices our passage in χ, and admits that, as in Sarpedon's case, the man may have fallen with the spear as it was drawn out of the wound. That he should incline to fall forward, through 'ducking' as he saw Telemachus' spear coming, (εἰς) μέσον κευῶνα, is not to be wondered at. And lastly, who expects complete exactitude in the Μνῆστῆροφονία? Its absurdities, as has often been pointed out, sautent aux yeux. Yet they are not put down to imitation.

χ 308 sq., τύπτον ἐπιστροφάδην τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ' ἀεικῆς | κράτων τυπτομένων, δάπεδον δ' ἄπαν αἵματι θύε. 'This couplet occurs in Φ 20 sq.'—but see also K 483 sq. and ω 184 sq.; it is really of the stock epic commonplace—'with the difference that in place of κράτων τυπτομένων we find ἄορι θεινομένων—doubtless the original formula, altered because in the slaughter of the Suitors Ulysses was not armed with a sword. This substitution is not quite successful: κράτων τυπτομένων has not a clear construction; and ἐπιστροφάδην does not suit a battle fought with the spear only.' But Telemachus certainly had a sword (φ 119, 431), though his father apparently had not (χ 326). And it is not correct to speak of a 'battle'; it was the spearing, after the fight, of the living remnant of the Wooers taking refuge where they could (χ 299). As to κράτων τυπτομένων, the mention of heads may be thought peculiar. But if the rejection by the imitator of the ἄορι θεινομένων in his original was due to the fact that Odysseus had not a sword but a spear, why did he not write ἔγχεϊ or δούρατι τυπτομένων? It cannot be said that the proof of an imitator is any clearer than the passage itself. As to the construction of κράτων τυπτ., Hayman finds no difficulty. 'τῶν being the persons, κράτων is in apposition as part to whole, just as in Τηλέμαχον βάλε χεῖρ' above, 277.'

χ 494, μέγαρον καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλήν. 'In Z 316 θάλαμον καὶ δ. καὶ αὐ. expresses the three parts of a complete dwelling. Probably μέγαρον was substituted here, because that part especially needed purification: but the phrase thus became tautologous, since δῶμα is properly = μέγαρον.' Surely a trivial objection, both in substance and in effect. δῶμα may include more than the mere μέγαρον, 'the entire pile of buildings' in fact (Hayman, *a.l.*). Here, where the μέγαρον is naturally mentioned first as requiring purification, δῶμα seems to mean the rest of the building. And observe, the expression in Z is not a standing form of words; indeed it does not recur. One might take exception to it. See Dr. Leaf's note on it, and Hayman, *l.c.* Seymour (*op. cit.* 196) treats the phrases in Z and χ as identical.

ρ 57 = τ 29, φ 386, χ 398, τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἐπλετο μῦθος. 'This half line must have been formed as an allusion to the ἔπεα πτερόεντα of the *Iliad*. It is not intelligible on any other supposition.' But why 'of the *Iliad*'? ἔπεα

πεπρόντα is not peculiar to that poem. The expression in question is well explained by Hayman on ρ 57, and no supposition of imitation is necessary to the elucidation of its origin.

In the next batch of cases Dr. Monro goes further, and seeks to show that there is not merely imitation but also—a strange intrusion on the gravity of the epic—parody of the *Iliad*. It is not the first attempt to prove the presence of parody. Kayser (*Hom. Abhandlungen*, 54) made a curious collection of parallelisms to establish *illud ridiculi genus quod parodiae insignitur nomine* in Nestor's story in the end of Δ. It is interesting to find among them a case of parody of the *Odyssey* by the *Iliad*—Λ 720, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἱππεύσι μετέπρεπον ἡμετέροισι, compared with κ 525, (δὴν ἱερευσέμεν) παμμέλαν', ὃς μῆλοισι μεταπρέπει ἡμετέροισι. On the face of this doublette one would be disposed to argue the reverse way, and, in fact, Sittl (*op. cit.* 38) concludes that there is imitation by the *Odyssey*. So much depends on the point of view in this most hazardous enterprise of determining priority.

The passages on which Dr. Monro depends are :

ο 161, αἰετὸς ἀργὴν χῆνα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι πέλωρον, said to be imitated from M 201 sq., αἰετὸς . . . φοινίχοντα δράκοντα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι πέλωρον. 'πέλωρος is appropriate to a serpent, but the application of it to a goose gives a certain mock-heroic effect.' Only because a goose is a goose in these days, and because the translator chooses to use the word 'serpent.' Transfer the goose to the *Iliad* and place a mere snake in the *Odyssey*, and the argument would still go against the latter poem—'how appropriate the epithet is when used of a fat goose, how absurd of a slender reptile!' And see the difficulty in which the mock-heroic explanation lands us. The man who makes this *faux pas* was, to Dr. Monro, the author of the *Odyssey*, of the poem as, with small deductions, we have it to-day, full of magnificent scenes, including this beautiful parting idyll in ο. Yet we are to believe that, when he was writing it, the great poet's taste so failed him that he was incapable of saying 'no' to a goose, when that un-heroic bird obtruded itself on his imagination and tempted him to most un-epic pleasantry. It is hardly thinkable.

In ρ 541 it is said that Telemachus μέγ' ἔπαρεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ δῶμα σμερδαλέον κονάβησε. The final phrase 'is used in the *Iliad* of the shout of an army (B 334, Π 277), of its tread (B 466), of the rattle of armour (N 498, O 648, Φ 255, 593).' In fact, it is of the *Gemeingut* or standing commonplace. 'Applied, as here, to the sound of' (a room resounding to?) 'a sneeze it has the effect of a parody.' The remark is incomprehensible. There are sneezes and sneezes. There is a sneeze that is perceptible only from the facial contortion of the sufferer, and that only excites the pity of the beholder—οἰκτος δ' ἔλε πάντας ὀρώντας. There is also a sneeze which is explodent, almost expletive, which is brain-clearing and attention-compelling, a splendid yell with to some brains all the force of an epithet of the direst kind. To which category did Telemachus' sneeze belong or incline? We can only say the μέγ' seems to indicate that it was no ordinary one. In fact it is one of the numerous omens

of the *Odyssey*.  
omen' (H  
to the eff  
might thi  
tramp of

The  
In the π  
πόλεμος i  
Dr. Monr  
As regar  
point. 'w  
which th  
For a 35  
passages  
position  
interview  
τοῦ γὰρ  
μύθου οἱ  
There is  
occurre  
Shall w  
descript  
it is un  
once fi  
applicat  
able co

La  
lofty ep  
farmya  
πεντήκ  
in the  
to the  
opport  
are to  
treatm  
ἰλακό  
ment  
precis  
himse  
borro  
The e  
how  
times  
Amel

of the *Odyssey*, and 'the loudness of the sneeze gave increased weight to the omen' (Hayman). And surely the poet's application of *σμερδαλέον κονάβησε* to the effect of such a sneeze in a ceilingless hall is at least as good as, some might think infinitely better than, its use of a spear striking a corslet or of the tramp of men's feet.

The next is a much discussed case—Z 490 sqq., α 356 sqq., and φ 350 sqq. In the *πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει πᾶσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα* of the first passage, *πόλεμος* is replaced by *μῦθος* in the second, and by *τόξον* in the third. In both Dr. Monro (on φ 350 sqq.) finds 'adaptation, or parody, of Hector's words in Z.' As regards the lines in φ, surely the close of Dr. Monro's own note settles the point. 'The bow was to be "the concern of men, all of them," in a sense which they did not anticipate.' There is irony, but is that so rare in the poems? For α 359 reference may be made to the note of Merry and Riddell. In both passages Telemachus is speaking with perfect seriousness, and asserting his position in the house. He accepts his responsibilities, after his encouraging interview with Athene in α. In each case his speech ends with the sentence *τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἔστ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ*, where *τοῦ* has not, as has sometimes been assumed, *μῦθον* or *τόξον* understood, but is to be translated, 'of me, the man speaking.' There is no ground for alleging parody. And note that there are two other occurrences of the essential words, λ 352 and T 137—five occurrences in all. Shall we not say, not with Dr. Monro that the expression was proverbial—the description does not seem to meet the case—but that it was a formula? And it is unnecessary to insist on what has often been remarked, that, a formula once fixed, the poet allows himself a certain amount of freedom as to its application. But indeed, in the present case, there is no ground for unfavourable comment.

Lastly, 'in some other cases the spirit of parody is shown by the use of a lofty epic formula where the subject is unworthy of it. Thus the sties in the farmyard of Eumaeus (ξ 13-15) imitate the palace of Priam (Z 244 sqq., note *πεντήκοντα* and *πλησίον ἀλλήλων*).' This word and expression, both common in the poems and neither of them lofty in character, are the *only points common* to the two descriptions. A parodist would surely have made better use of his opportunity and materials. The Odyssean poet has failed entirely, unless we are to see the real joke in the exclusion of the boars as contrasted with the treatment accorded to the sons-in-law of Priam. 'The epithet of the dogs, *ὑλακόμωροι* (ξ 29), is a parody of the epic *ἐγχεσίμωροι*.' A very extreme statement in any case, but especially difficult of acceptance as 'we cannot tell what precise meaning (if any) was given by the latter part of the word' (Monro himself on ξ 29). 'Again, in the story of Iros, the language of the *Iliad* is borrowed or parodied—e.g. ιτ σ 5, *πόντια μήτηρ* (of the mother of Iros).' The expression is by no means peculiar to the *Iliad*, and no one who observes how freely, and how inappropriately, *to our minds*, the Homeric epithets are at times applied, will find any ground for objection. Other authorities differ, as Ameis-Hentze *a.l.* and Filipsky *Das stehende Beiwort in Volksepos*, 11. 'σ 46,

ὁππότερος δέ κε νικήσῃ κ.τ.λ. (from the duel of Paris and Menelaus=Γ 92).<sup>1</sup> Had the author of σ said (of Odysseus and Iros) 'whichever of these two champions overcomes the other with soul-rending fury,' or made some reference to one of the great encounters of the *Iliad*, we should have felt more certain. But, as it is, how *could* the poet have said what he had to say more simply? Had Γ 92 not existed, no one would ever have suggested that σ 46 more than meets the case. The same remark applies to πεπνυμένω ἄμφω, σ 65 (and Γ 148). What ground is there for arguing that Telemachus is not speaking seriously? Finally, σ 105, ἐνταυθοὶ νῦν ἦσο (Odysseus to Iros after he has dragged him out of the house and set him against the ἐρκίον αὐλῆς). It is said to be from Φ 122, ἐνταυθοὶ νῦν κείσο (Achilles to Lycaon, whose body he has flung into the river). In υ 262 we have the same formula—for that is what it is—ἐνταυθοὶ νῦν ἦσο, said respectfully by Telemachus to his father, then disguised as a beggar. Ought we not to say that both σ and Φ parody υ?

This set of cases seems to be particularly weak. If parody is to be argued simply because one of two parallel passages is not so perfectly suited to the context as the other, it must be said to be very common in the poems. But in those under reference it does not appear that evidence even of incongruity has been adduced. To establish parody some proof of an intention to travesty is certainly necessary.

To revert to the passages on which simple imitation or borrowing is inferred, one must surely say that the evidence of this ought to be extremely cogent to negative the *prima facie* presumption which arises from the prevalence of the epic practice of repetition. Now in most of the instances the case set up seems to vanish altogether on examination. In three—γ 245, ξ 156, and φ 335—there is perhaps some slight ground for argument, but they together constitute but a slender basis for a theory of wholesale imitation. The crucial point is, is there reason for inferring the existence of a later poet appropriating and adapting the work of a predecessor? It is submitted, as a result of the examination in detail given above, that there is nothing incompatible with the view that we have the same poet freely availing himself of the epic privilege of repetition.

It would not be difficult to prove, by the method adopted by Sittl and other repetition-experts, that the *Iliad* imitates the *Odyssey*. As has often been said, the method is one by which any given part of the epics may be shown to be later or earlier than another, as the individual enquirer may desire. How easily the tables may be turned has been well shown in pp. 318 sqq. of Professor Scott's paper quoted above. Other instances could be given.

The Chorizontic attack has been threefold. On this point of imitation it appears to fail. It has not succeeded with the Language. As for the *Realien*, the case remains much as it was when first propounded. Two thousand years have added little to the proof given by the original authors of the παράδοξον.

A. SHEWAN.



## THUCYDIDEA.

### PART II. MISCELLANEOUS EMENDATIONS (*continued*).

#### BOOK II.

4. 2. Read ἐπιγυγνομένων, just as προσβαλόντων has been corrected. The rain was still falling.

7. 2. Two points may be urged against the MS. reading. First Λακεδαιμονίους ἐπετάχθη (or -θησαν) is an extremely awkward construction, if it means that they gave, not received, the order. In Thucydides the dative is quite rare in this use with passives, except of course with perfect tenses, and the cases in which it most often occurs will not be compared with this by any competent scholar (e.g. τοῖς Κερκυραίοις οὐχ ἐωρῶντο, τοῖς πάλαι ἐδοκιμάσθη). But special awkwardness arises from the fact that ἐπιτάττω naturally takes a dative of a quite different kind, and that in this sentence such a dative is actually added. Cf. on 3. 82. 7. Such a construction however does occasionally occur, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* 3. 2. 20. The second point is that the Oxyrhynchus commentary, like the scholia, seems unaware of any special difficulty. It is not perfect here, but we can see that it does not comment, as it could hardly have failed to do, on language so obscure and strange.

The conjectural Λακεδαιμόνιοι . . . ἐπέταξαν therefore seems probable, though the mistake is not well accounted for.

11. 3. Is ἡγεμόνα καὶ στρατιώτην enough without ἕκαστον or ἅπαντα added?

13. 9. ταῦτα should certainly be τοσαῦτα, ἕκαστα τούτων being the subject. Cf. the beginning of § 7. Περικλῆς might be omitted.

16. 1. The difficulty of μετείχον would be surmounted, if we read <ῆς> μετείχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. This would not mean that the Athenians shared it with one another, i.e. all practised it. A πάντες would be needed to give that sense. It would mean that they shared it with other Greeks. In 15. 1 Thucydides has already said that they practised it ἐτέρων μᾶλλον, and we are reminded of the life κατὰ κόμας often mentioned or referred to (Thuc. 1. 2. 2, Ar. *Pol.* 1305 a 19, etc.).

τῇ οἰκῇσιν will then be a causal dative. τ' οὖν should probably be δ' οὖν, marking a return from the historical digression of 15 to the narrative, but it is still possible to keep τε, τῇ τ' οἰκῇσιν καὶ διὰ τὸ ἔθος.

17. 3. κατεσκευάσαντο δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πύργοις.

A parallel for this absolute use of κατασκευάζομαι without an accusative will hardly be found. Xen. *Cyrob.* 7. 5. 37 is one, but κατασκευάσθαι (passive) may well be read there for κατασκευάσασθαι. Here κατασκευήσαντο seems likely. Cf. 52. 3 τὰ ἱερὰ ἐν οἷς ἐσκήνηντο: Xen. *Hell.* 4. 5. 2 κατασκευήσας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. In I. 133. 1 Shilleto's reverse correction of σκηνησαμένου to σκευασαμένου is likely enough to be right, for there a transitive verb is needed.

22. 3. <εἰς> ἀπὸ τῆς στάσεως ἐκατέρως? α' (=εἰς) lost before ἀπὸ. So 34. 3 φυλῆς ἐκάστης μίαν.

26. 1. ἅμα φυλακὴν <εἶναι>? εἶναι might fall out easily between ἡν and ε.

37. 1. Should ἔχων δέ be changed to ἔχων δὴ rather than Reiske's ἔχων γε?

ib. 3. τὰ δημόσια διὰ δέος μάλιστα οὐ παρανομούμεν, τῶν τε αἰεὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσει καὶ τῶν νόμων κ.τ.λ.

Surely a singular compliment for any speaker to pay his audience, that, if they did not do wrong, it was because they were afraid; that is, that they would do it, if fear did not restrain them. It is idle to fancy that δέος means not commonplace fear, but some high moral and religious awe. 42. 4, I. 120. 5, and other places exhibit it in its natural sense. If Prodicus wished (*Protag.* 358 D) to distinguish it from φόβος, it was not on this ground. μάλιστα too is odd, emphasizing διὰ δέος; 'moral motives may go for something, but downright fear is our main motive'; as though this was rather to their credit.

Though the Oxyrhynchus commentator supports the text as it is, I venture to think that Thucydides wrote <οὐ> διὰ δέος . . τῶν δὲ (for τε) κ.τ.λ., 'not through mere fear, but out of obedience to magistrates and νόμοι,' νόμοι being not only laws but also usages and the rules of public opinion. Observe that the νόμοι most dwelt upon are 'those which entail acknowledged shame,' a point more relevant to moral or semi-moral motives than to ordinary fear. Juvenal says of the man in Herodotus' story *reddidit ergo metu, non moribus*; Thucydides means that the Athenians kept straight chiefly *moribus*, *non metu*. His antithesis of νόμοι and τρόποι in 39. 4 will be different and not quite consistent in expression.

For the two independent negatives, οὐ διὰ δέος μάλιστα οὐ παρανομούμεν, cf. Kühner-Gerth, § 514 A. 1 (e.g. Plat. *Rep.* 406 c οὐκ ἀγνοία οὐδὲ ἀπειρία . . οὐ κατέδειξεν αὐτό, ἀλλ' εἰδὼς κ.τ.λ.: Dem. 19. 77).

39. 4. καὶ ἐν τε τούτοις <λέγω> κ.τ.λ.? Cf. 41. 1 ξυνελών τε λέγω κ.τ.λ. The division of Chh. 39 and 40 should have been made before καὶ ἐν τε τούτοις.

40. 2. See my *Aristophanes and Others*, p. 297.

[οἱ] αὐτοὶ may be due to τοῖς αὐτοῖς above, οἱ αὐτοὶ below. Simple αὐτοὶ is much better.

ib. 3. If we wrote ᾄ for ὄ, we should get, not indeed a regular construction, but something more natural. The plural ᾄ would suit the antithesis

better.  
plausible

41.  
44.  
die in li  
the wor  
need no  
suggeste  
ἐναγγήσ  
ἄν (ἄν  
into ὀλ

47.  
λεγόμεν  
48.  
καὶ

seems v  
hardly  
Herod.  
ἐκφυγόν  
49.  
ib.

an obje  
53.  
προταλ

62.  
65.

that M  
phrase  
τοῖς λό  
any ra  
that so  
the da  
πόλεω  
κατεσ

εἰπορα  
1314  
Hell. 6

7.  
to refe

7.  
thems  
been l  
8.  
8.



better. In 4. 13. 4 and 64. 1 the change of  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\rho$  to  $\omicron$  and  $\omicron\pi\epsilon\rho$  is very plausible: so too in 1. 78. 3.

41. 4. οὔτε <ἄλλου> ὅστις?

44. 1. The absurdity of ἐντελευτήσας, as though a man could be said to die *in* life, has sometimes been seen. It seems to have escaped notice that the word is due to τελευτήης coming just before. The original word therefore need not have resembled ἐντελευτήσας closely or at all. Herwerden probably suggested ἐνταλαιπωρήσας on the ground of a certain resemblance. But ἐναλγῆσαι (Classen, who also thought of ἐλληνηθῆναι) is perhaps better. οἷς ἂν (ἂν lost before ἐν-) and ξυμμετρηθῇ is an easier change than turning οἷς into ὀλίγοις.

47. 3. The -ον of λεγόμενον may be due only to πρότερον adjoining. λεγομένη is much more likely.

48. 3. αὐτός τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους νοσοῦντας.

καὶ πολλοὺς ἰδὼν? The second αὐτός is very pointless, and a πολλοὺς seems wanted. We do not need to be told that he saw them himself, and hardly that he did see them; that he saw many is worth mentioning. Cf. Herod. 1. 197 ἄσσα αὐτὸς ποιήσας ἐξέφηνε ὁμοίην νοῦσον ἢ ἄλλον εἶδε ἐκφυγόντα.

49. 5. μηδὲ (for μήτε) τῶν πάντων λ.?

ib. 7. αὐτόν or αὐτούς for αὐτοῦ? αὐτοῦ is awkward, and the verb wants an object.

53. 3. Perhaps τῷ δόξοντι, not δόξαντι, καλῶ, especially if we read προταλαιπωρεῖν.

62. 1. οὐτ' ἐγὼ <ἔδειξα>, or something similar?

65. 2. Though the datives certainly cannot depend on καλὰ, it is strange that Madvig's insertion of ἐν has found any favour (Stahl, Hude). Such a phrase as καλὰ κτήματα ἐν (consisting in) οἰκοδομαίαις is probably unknown: ἡ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις διδασκαλική is not at all parallel, ἐν there being instrumental, or at any rate the λόγοι and the διδασκαλική not being the same. It is more likely that some word, presumably a participle, agreeing with χώραν and governing the datives, has been lost, e.g. κατεσκευασμένην or κεκοσμημένην. Cf. 1. 10. 2 πόλεως ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκευαῖς πολυτέλεσι χρησαμένης: 6. 91. 7 οἷς ἡ χώρα κατεσκευάσται: 8. 24. 3 τὴν χώραν καλῶς κατεσκευασμένην: Dem. 19. 89 εἰμπορώτερα . . . κατασκευαῖς ὅπλων καὶ χώρας καὶ προσόδων: Arg. Pol. 8. 11. 1314 b 37 κατασκευάζειν καὶ κοσμεῖν τὴν πόλιν and ib. 7. 7. 1321 a 37: Xen. Hell. 6. 2. 6.

72. 1. τῶν ἄλλων must = τοῖς ἄλλους above. But then αὐτῶν has nothing to refer to. Perhaps <ὑμῶν> αὐτῶν, answering to αὐτοί above.

74. 2. τοῖς ὑπ. προτ. cannot depend on ξυγγνώμονες, as though they themselves wanted to be punished. Some word, e.g. ξυμβαίνειν, must have been lost.

80. 1 and 8 and 102. 6. See my Notes on Xenophon and Others, pp. 286, 289.

84. 2. τῶν νεῶν <οἷ> ἄμεινον πλεουσῶν?

87. 3. ταῖς μὲν τύχαις ἐνδέχασθαι σφάλλῃσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ταῖς δὲ γνώμαις τοὺς αὐτοὺς αἰεὶ ὀρθῶς ἀνδρείους εἶναι.

The latter words are obscure. The truth is that Thucydides wrote <τοὺς> ἀνδρείους, and that this is the subject of the verb. Men do not always enjoy the same success, but brave men are always rightly the same in spirit. Cf. 5. 75. 3 τύχη μὲν . . . κακίζόμενοι, γνώμη δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ ἔτι ὄντες. The μή in τὸ μὴ κατὰ κράτος νικηθέν just above should not be omitted with B. Thucydides is speaking in almost identical terms of Milton's

courage never to submit or yield,  
And what is else *not to be overcome*.

89. 5. τοῦ παρὰ πολὺ is probably a mistaken repetition of the παρὰ πολὺ three lines above, the real phrase being (say) τοῦ παρὰ γνώμην or δόξαν. Cf. τῷ οὐκ εἰκότι in 6. τοῦ παραλόγου has been suggested (Steup). Cf. Plut. Caesar 32 ἐκπλήξην ἀπιστούμενος ῥᾶν ἢ βιάσσεσθαι μετὰ παρασκευῆς ἐπελθών.

90. 1. παρὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν, going with ἔπλεον, must be accepted from C and G. ἐπί occurs four times within a few lines, not to mention ἐπέπλεον, ἐπίπλουν, and ἐπιβοηθῶν. Hence ἐπί here in most MSS. Cf. 83. 3: 8. 104. 1.

ib. 2. μέλλοντα for πλέοντα?

ib. 3. ἄκων καὶ <αὐτός> . . . ἔπλει? or has καί come from the next line?

94. 1. ὅπερ δὴ (for ἂν) ῥαδίως ἂν ἐγένετο? Several MSS. give ἂν after ῥαδίως as well as after ὅπερ.

### BOOK III.

4. 4. διαβάλλοντων?

11. 4. μὴ ἂν κ.τ.λ. is not the conclusion drawn but the argument used, the attestation afforded by the allies. We seem therefore to want μαρτυρίῃ ἐχρῶντο <τῷ> μὴ ἂν κ.τ.λ. 'they used as an attestation (of their being in the right) the fact that etc., like παραδείγμασι χρώμενοι τοῖς ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους in 8.

ib. Before knowing that Haase corrected τὰ (τελευταία) to αὐτά, I had done the same. In 6. 64. 3 MSS. vary between τοὺς and αὐτοὺς.

26. 4. ἐπιμένοντες . . . τι πεύσεσθαι.

Either πυθέσθαι (the common confusion of σ and θ) or something like πεύσεσθαι <ἡγούμενοι>. Cf. on 8. 2. 1.

30. 4. A man may be said quite well ἐνορᾶν τοῖς πολεμίοις τὸ κενὸν τοῦ πολέμου, τὸ κενόν being something that seems serious and formidable without really being so. But how he can be said ἐν αὐτῷ φυλάσσεσθαι τὸ κενόν is not easy to see. It is indeed rather his business to aim at it as a deception of the enemy. This points to τὸ καινόν, novelties, new courses struck out in war, which a man should guard against in his own case and try upon the enemy when he affords an opening. Cf. 5. 9. 3-5 in part. On the other hand in Ar. Eth. 3. 8. 1116 b. 7 κενά makes much the best sense: in fact καινά hardly

makes any. The very point of *ἐμπειρία* is that the things are not new, but familiar and known not to amount to much.

*ἀλκή* above does not admit of the very forced meaning which Steup after Junghahn gives it. It means *in which we are as a matter of fact very strong*.

34. 3. *καταστήσαι* for *καταστήσειν*? The future is quite uncommon. Xen. *Hell.* 3. 5. 1 has however *ἐφ' ᾧ τε ἐξοίσειν*, which can hardly be wrong.

38. 1. As the MSS. agree in *ὅν* after *ἀντίπαλον*, perhaps we should read *ἀντίπαλον ἄν . . . ἀναλαμβάνοι*.

ib. 5. *ἀπατᾶσθαι* ἄριστοι. Possibly *ῥᾶστοι*, as in 4. 10. 3.

ib. 6. *εἶναι* gives no good sense. *ὄντες*?

39. 6. *νῦν* πάλιν <*ἀδεῶς*> or <*ἀκινδύνως*> *ἐν τῇ πόλει εἶναι*?

The present text seems to imply that they would have meanwhile quitted Mytilene in a body.

44. 2. It does not seem to have been suggested that *εἶεν* is sound, but that a few words have by accident been lost. Something like *οὐκ ἂν ἀφετέοι εἶεν* would make excellent sense. *ξυγγνωστοί* would account better than *ἀφετέοι* for the omission, the copyist confusing *ξυγγνωστοί* and *ξυγγνώμης*, but its personal use seems not found in good Greek.

45. 7. *ἔξειν* for *ἔχειν*? The future seems rather more suitable to the exact sense. Cf. on 52. 2: 4. 71. 2.

47. 5. Should *ἐν αὐτῷ* be *ἐν αὐτῇ*, i.e. the *τιμαῖρα* now proposed?

51. 2. Perhaps *τηροῦσιν* (dative plural) has been lost after *Πελοποννησίους*. *μηδὲν ἐσπλεῖν* could depend on it as in 7. 17. 2 *μηδὲνα περαιούσθαι* depends on *φυλάσσειν*.

52. 2. *προσπέμπει* δὲ κ.τ.λ.

This sentence will be found less remarkable, if it is noticed that *λέγειν* *εἶ* and similar phrases seem to be idiomatic. Cf. 4. 37. 2 (probably) *ἐκήρυξαν τε εἰ βούλονται τὰ ὅπλα παραδοῦναι*: 5. 115. 2 *ἐκήρυξαν δὲ εἰ τις βούλεται . . . λῆζεσθαι*: perhaps 2. 2. 4: 5. 76. 3 *δύο λόγῳ, τὸν μὲν καθ' ὅτι εἰ βούλονται πολεμεῖν κ.τ.λ.* seems to be something of the same sort. So *Il.* 7. 375 (*ἴτω . . . εἰπέμεν . . .*) *καὶ δὲ τόδ' εἰπέμεναι πυκινὸν ἔπος, αἶ κ' ἐθέλωσιν παύσασθαι πολέμοιο*. ib. 21. 487 *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις κ.τ.λ.* has no apodosis.

*κολάζειν* must be corrected to *κολάσειν* with Krueger.

ib. 4. The first *ἔλεγον* should be *ἀντέλεγον*, *they protested*.

55. 3. *οὗς εὖ παθὼν τις καὶ αὐτὸς δεόμενος προσηγάγετο ξυμμάχους*.

The past tense of *παθὼν* makes no sense. Did not Thucydides write *παθεῖν*, dependent on *δεόμενος*, *needing*, or *asking for*, *help*. Cf. 40. 3 *τὸ παθεῖν εὖ ἀντιλήφονται*.

58. 5. The use of the present tense *ἐρημοῦτε* with regard to the future, stating the sure consequence of a possible action, is not in itself at all remarkable. There are many instances in Thucydides (1. 143. 5, 4. 95. 2, 6. 91. 3, etc.) and elsewhere. Even the combination of such a present with the more commonplace future can be paralleled from Antiphon (who has so much in common with Thucydides) 3. 3. 11 *καταλαβόντες αὐτόν . . . καθαροί . . .*

ἔσεσθε, ἀπολύσαντες δὲ ὑπαίτιοι καθίστασθε. This corresponds exactly to our δουλώσετε . . . ἐρημοῦτε. What is really strange in our passage and can hardly be right is the recurrence in a third verb to the original future. This is so awkward that I incline to think ἀφαιρήσεσθε a mistake for ἀφαιρείσθε. Even without δουλώσετε the error would be easy.

63. 2. ἰκανή γάρ?

65. 3. σωφρονισταὶ ὄντες τῆς γνώμης καὶ τῶν σωμάτων <σωτήρες> or <σωτήρες> τῶν σωμάτων? The repeated σω might cause the loss.

66. 3. Perhaps ταύτας τρεῖς ἀδικίας . . . πράξαντες, 'these things, three distinct acts of wrong.'

67. Two or three times in this chapter it seems to me that a word has been lost, as in 65. 3. In 1 ταῦτα . . . ἐπεξήλθομεν . . . ἵνα ὑμεῖς μὲν εἰδῇτε δικαίως αὐτῶν καταγνωσόμενοι, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἔτι ὁσιώτερον τετιμωρημένοι it makes no sense to say ἐπεξήλθομεν ἵνα εἰδῶμεν, as though their knowing it was consequent on their own recital of facts, nor can anything more suitable be supplied naturally out of εἰδῇτε. After ἡμεῖς δὲ insert something like δειξώμεν, δηλοῖ ὤμεν. Again it can hardly be said of previous ἀρεταί that they ought to be διπλάσιαι ζημίαι to wrongdoers: it is more likely that φέρειν (2. 37. 3) was used, bring, entail. Thirdly in 5 οὐκ ἀνταποδόντες again gives no sense, and I am not convinced that οὐκ ἂν ἀνταποδόντες (Dobree) or οὐκ ἀνταποδώσοντας (Stahl) could be attached in the required sense to παρενόμησαν. Greek idiom would require rather παρανομήσαντες οὐκ ἂν ἀνταποδοῖεν. May not Thucydides have written something like καὶ <φανήσονται> οὐκ ἀνταποδόντες κ.τ.λ.? Steup proposes to read οὐ δόξουσιν οὐκ ἀνταποδόντες, forgetting that δοκῶ takes an infinitive, not a participle.

In § 3 κατ' οἰκίαν would be a trifle nearer than κατ' οἰκίας (Stahl) to καὶ οἰκίαι, and I think grammatically as good. ἐρημία in 2 and 5 points to ἐρήμοι here being used of men, not homes. In § 7 I would take πρὸς τοὺς ξύμπαντας of the whole body of prisoners; cf. 68. 1 ἐξαίρετον ἐποίησαντο οὐδένα.

68. 1. Has it ever been suggested that ὥς resumes the preceding ὅτε in the way in which we sometimes find both ὅτι and ὥς introducing something in *oratio obliqua*, with some words intervening between them (just as in English *that* is often in such a case ungrammatically repeated)? This would carry us through the sentence without any omission or change.

The aorist παραγαγόντες should rather be the present, like ἐρωτῶντες, and ἔξεν in line 2 might very well in view of 52. 4 be ἔχειν.

75. 4. ὁπλισθεῖς should be ὀργισθεῖς (Cobet). The error is due to ὅπλα below.

81. 5. καὶ, οἶον φιλεῖ ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ γίγνεσθαι, οὐδὲν ὅτι οὐ ξυνέβη καὶ ἔτι περαιτέρω.

To this there are two objections: (1) it is not true that in most Greek *στάσεις* (ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ) every possible excess was committed, and (2), when you have said 'every possible excess,' there is no room for 'and still more': the parallels cited are by no means equally strong, not even that in Sallust.

We might consider the possibility of *καὶ οὖν φιλεῖ* . . . *γίγνεσθαι οὐδὲν κ.τ.λ.* i.e. *οὐδὲν τοιούτων ἂ φιλεῖ*. I have illustrated this construction in *Platonica*, p. 12. Thucydides has it in 7. 67. 3 *ἀφ' ὧν ἡμῖν παρσκευάσται*.

82. 3. *δ' οὖν* might be looked for rather than *τ' οὖν*, as in 84. 1. Cf. on 2. 16. 1.

ib. 4. *τι* for *τό* (as elsewhere) before *ἐπιβουλεύσασθαι*?

ib. 7. I think we must acquiesce in *φθάσας θαρσῆσαι*, as we have to do in an infinitive after *δηλοῦντες* and *δῆλοι ὄντες* in 4. 38. 1 and 47. 2, and as on the other hand a participle is used after *παράδειγμα καθιστάνας* in 3. 40. 7 and after *π. ποιῶν* ib. 67. 6. *θαρσῆσαι* has been omitted, but, though essential to the real sense, it is unlikely that anyone would have inserted it.

ib. 8. In *πάντων δ' αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.* various changes have been proposed, including *ἡ λίαν πλεονεξία*. The use of *ἀρχή* for *ἀρχῆς ἐπιθυμία* is very obscure and awkward, without parallel, and not to be justified by the fairly frequent idiomatic sense of *gloria* in Latin. Also it would appear that *ἀρχή* is not the ultimate cause after all: *πλεονεξία* and *φιλοτιμία* are behind it. It seems possible that we should read *πάντων δ' αὐτῶν αἰτιον ἀρχῆς ἡ ἰδία πλεονεξία καὶ φιλοτιμία*. With the pleonasm *αἰτιον ἀρχῆς*, cause of the beginning, cf. 5. 71. 1 *ἡγείται τῆς αἰτίας ταύτης*, if *αἰτία* there is cause, and Ar. *Eth.* 5. 8. 1135 b 19 *ἡ ἀρχή* . . . *τῆς αἰτίας*, if *αἰτίας* is right.

In the next clause we seem to want some more condemnatory expression than *τὸ πρόθυμον*. If we read *καθιστάμενον* for *-ων*, the sense will be better.

84. 1. *μάλιστα δ' ἂν* probably was originally, or contained, *μάλιστα δῆ. ἂν* however seems required for the three optatives, which are more likely here to express what certain men would do than what certain men often actually did. For this purpose one *ἂν* with the first optative (not with the second) is sufficient, and we should either transfer this *ἂν* or insert one. Hude *ὁπόσ' ἂν*, but *ἂν* is equally likely after *δράσειαν*. In any case *μάλιστα δ' ἂν* can hardly be right.

Perhaps *οἱ τε* should be *οἱ δέ* and others.

91. 3. *οἱ ὁπλῖται <οἱ> ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν*. Cf. on 8. 23. 5.

93. 2. *αἴτιον δ' ἦν ὅτι Θετταλοί*? Cf. 2. 65. 8.

97. 2. *τούτοις τε πεισθεὶς καὶ τῇ τύχῃ ἐλπίσας*.

Both the construction of the dative and still more the absolute use of *ἐλπίσας* are noticeable. Perhaps an infinitive is missing, e.g. *χρήσασθαι*.

98. 4. Perhaps *<οἷς> καὶ ἡλικία ἡ αὐτή*. As they stand, the words could surely only mean something like *the same supply of soldiers*, as in 8. 1. 2 etc.

102. 3. Read *δέσας περὶ αὐτῇ*, as is regular, not the genitive. Cf. below on 8. 93. 3, the only parallel cited.

113. 4. *οὐκουν τὰ ὅπλα ταυτὶ φαίνεται*.

I think the sense needs *ταυτὶ <τοσαῦτα> φαίνεται*.

114. 4. *διέλυσαν τὸν πόλεμον*.

The parties to a war are always said *διαλύεσθαι τὸν πόλεμον*. 8. 46. 1, where *διαλῶσαι* is used of Tissaphernes, is just the exception which proves

the rule, for he is thought of not as a party but as bringing to an end the war between Athens and Sparta. Here the last two letters of *διελύσαντο* were absorbed in *τόν*.

## BOOK IV.

8. 7. If *ταύτην* after *νῆσον* is not to be omitted (Rutherford), we might read *αὐτήν*, the island itself contrasted with the channels on either side.

9. 2. *σφίσι δὲ τοῦ τείχους ταύτῃ ἀσθενεστάτου ὄντος ἐπισπάσασθαι αὐτοὺς ἡγεῖτο προθυμήσεσθαι*.

Dobree *ἐπισπάσασθαι*, omitting *προθυμήσεσθαι*. Others have proposed *ἐπιβήσεσθαι* (Madvig), *βιάσεσθαι*, *ἐκβιάσεσθαι*. But there is an aorist more like *ἐπισπάσασθαι* than any of these futures, which I have no doubt Thucydides wrote, and that is *ἐφάψασθαι*. Cf. *Od.* 5. 348 *ἐπὶ χεῖρεσσιν ἐφάψεται ἡπείροιο*: *Eur. Hel.* 556 *τοῦδ' ἐφάπτομαι τόπου*. It is a curious coincidence that in *Phaedr.* 273A, where Plato has occasion to use *ἐφηψάμεθα*, the word is corrupted in B to *ἐψηφισάμεθα*.

In the following clause we should read *οὐδέ* for *οὔτε* and make *οὐδέ* . . . *εἰλείχον* parenthetic, *ἐκείνοις τε κ.τ.λ.* depending directly on *ἡγεῖτο*.

10. 3. *χωρίου . . . ὃ μενόντων μὲν ἡμῶν ξύμμαχον γίγνεται, ὑποχωρήσασι δὲ καίπερ χαλεπὸν ἐν εὐπορον ἔσται μηδενὸς κωλύοντος*.

*δ* is absent from the MSS., but found in Dionysius, who otherwise agrees with the MSS. No doubt it was absorbed in *-ω* (*νομίζω*). The dative *ὑποχωρήσασι* is difficult, if not impossible; for it refers, not to the people to whom the ground would be *εὐπορον*, but to those whose retirement would make it so to others, and what we should expect is the genitive absolute. Thucydides did actually write the genitive, I think, and what has happened is a very curious case of that exchange of terminations between words which has caused more corruption than is generally known. In the first clause we notice *ξύμμαχον*, which naturally takes a dative, but is oddly attached here to a genitive absolute, just as in the next clause the dative is odd. From this hint we can restore with fair confidence *ὃ μένουσι μὲν ἡμῶν ξύμμαχον γίγνεται, ὑποχωρησάντων δὲ κ.τ.λ.* The most similar cases I know of this interchange, though much less remarkable, are *Isaeus* 11. 21 *τὸν μὲν νικᾶσθαι, τὸν δὲ ἡττᾶν*, now corrected to *τὸν μὲν ἡττᾶσθαι, τὸν δὲ νικᾶν*, and *Diod.* 11. 71. 6 *μετὰ πολλῆς παρασκευῆς περὶ τὴν τοῦ στόλου προθυμίαν ἐγίνοντο*, where *μετὰ π. προθυμίας περὶ . . . παρασκευῆς* is now read. Cf. on 32. 4 and 133. 3.

10. 5. *δεινότητι*? Cf. in a way 3. 37. 5 *δεινότητι καὶ ξυνέσεως ἀγῶνι ἐπαιρομένους* (*δ*. of course in another sense). The genitive is due to the other genitives.

14. 3. Read *ὥς* for *καί* after *μέγας*. In 5 and again in 15. 1 this *ὥς* recurs.

16. 1. Unless we confuse the two senses of *σίτον*, there should be a comma after *ἀλφίτων*; i.e. it is only *δύο χ.* that is in apposition to *σίτον*. But the editors do not give it so.

Should *πλοῖον* before *μηδέν* be omitted? Cf. 27. 1: 2. 93. 4: etc.

17. 3. Read διδάσκεισθαι, governed by ἡγησάμενοι. ὥς cannot be taken twice over, ὥς διδασκόμενοι ὥς ἀξύνετοι. The corruption may be due to the other participle ἡγησάμενοι.

19. 2. τὸ αὐτό is not suitable. τοῦτο or αὐτὸ δρᾶν (ποιεῖν) is the proper and usual expression (2. 49. 5, 4. 59. 2, etc.). On the other hand in 3. 10. 6 μὴ δρᾶσαι τὸ αὐτό would be an improvement: cf. 3. 12. 1.

ib. 4. The dative after ἀνθησασᾶσθαι seems due to the ἀντι-, not, as the editors say, to a general notion of concession.

20. 2. Is ξυμφορὰς μετρίως κατατιθεμένης good Greek? κατατίθεσθαι πόλεμον occurs three or four times and is different in sense, *end a war, lay down their arms*. καλῶς (μετρίως, etc.) τίθεσθαι τι is the regular phrase (e.g. 17. 4, 61. 6), and no similar use of κατατίθεσθαι is cited.

20. 2. πολεμοῦνται ἀσαφῶς ὀποτέρων ἀρξάντων. 'They are at war in an obscure way with which side as aggressors.'

Should we not read ἀσαφές? Just as we have τοῦτο δῆλον ὅτι γενήσεται, i.e. δῆλον ἐστίν ὅτι, so this sentence would be in full πολεμοῦνται ἀσαφές (ἐστίν) ὀποτέρων ἀρξάντων, as we might say in English, 'they are at war, it is not clear for what reason.' Cf. 6. 60. 5 οἱ μὲν παθόντες ἄδηλον ἦν εἰ ἀδίκως ἐτετιμώρητο. But what the grammar of ἀσαφῶς would be it is hard to say.

30. 2. If we read ὥς ἀπὸ for καὶ ἀπὸ and put only a comma after κατακαυθέν, οὕτω δὴ will introduce, as it does in most cases, an apodosis.

ib. 4. τινὶ μετρία for τῇ μετρία, where the article is strange?

32. 1. λαβόντες τὴν ἀπόβασιν is a very unusual construction. ποιούμενοι and ποιησάμενοι have been inserted. <κατὰ> τὴν ἀπόβασιν might do and κατὰ have been lost from its occurring again in the next line. So in 3 we certainly seem to want (κατα) λαβόντες, for λαμβάνω is not used of seizing a place, and there too κατὰ occurs close by (as well as -τατα immediately before in the present text).

ib. 3. τὰ μετεωρότερα? Cf. on 55. 2.

τῷ πλήθει may be through their small numbers. Cf. 10. 5.

ib. 4. φεύγοντές τε γὰρ ἐκράτουν καὶ ἀναχωροῦσιν ἐπέκειντο.

It is not easy to see in what sense the Athenian light-armed 'conquered by (in) flight.' It is in fact as little true as the epigrammatic expression is Thucydidean. Nor does it stand very well coupled with καὶ ἀναχ. ἐπέκ. ἐκράτουν is sometimes translated *outstripped*, but it cannot mean that here. When we compare the two passages (2. 79. 6: 3. 97. 3) which are cited as parallel to this, we shall see that to make it really like them and to get a good sense we want ἐφευγόν τε γὰρ κρατούντων or κρατούντων τε γὰρ ἐφευγον. For the confusion of ἐφευγόν τε with φεύγοντες cf. below on 40. 2.

34. 1. τῇ ὄψει τοῦ θαρσεῖν τὸ πλείστον εἰληφότες.

Why should they be said to have derived most of it from sight of the enemy? Even if true, was it worth saying? Dobree τὸ πιστόν. As τὸ and τι, πλείστον and πλέον (πλείον) are quite apt to get exchanged, may we not read τοῦ θαρσεῖν τι πλέον?



36. 3. I have suggested before that ἀλλά should be ἄμα (*Aristophanes and Others*, 298). γιγνόμενοι would more naturally be γενόμενοι: they were not now getting into the situation, but were already there. Cf. on 1. 23. 6: 2. 4. 2.

40. 2. ἐρομένον . . . εἰ οἱ τεθνεώτες αὐτῶν καλοὶ κἀγαθοί.

We notice here two things. The point of the question, as it stands, is not very clear. It should not be whether the dead were brave, but whether the dead were the only brave men they had. This may be got to some extent by emphasizing οἱ τεθνεώτες, but it wants bringing out more distinctly. Secondly the editors have failed to observe that καλοὶ κἀγαθοί does not mean *brave*. That is ἀγαθός (92. 7: 2. 87. 9) or ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ only, and so ἀγαθοὺς follows here only two lines below. καλὸς κἀγαθός has a quite different meaning and one not at all suitable here, connoting general excellence, or sometimes 'gentlemanliness,' so that it becomes on occasion a political or party term (8. 48. 6).

Now καλός is confused occasionally with various words and among others with καί. We shall get then a pointed question in good Attic terms, if we read εἰ οἱ τεθνεώτες αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀγαθοί, *if their dead men were also their brave men*. For the predicate thus introduced with a καί cf. 62. 4: 92. 4 τὸ ἀντίπαλον καὶ ἐλεύθερον καθίσταται: Plato *Protag.* 350 B οἱ θαρραλέοι οὗτοι καὶ ἀνδρείοι εἰσιν, and again in C. Compare also in another way Eur. *El.* 378 μάρτυς ἡγενοί' ἂν ὅστις ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς and *Suppl.* 852.

ἀπιστούντες above should probably be ἠπίστανον τε (Dobree: cf. on 32. 4). We might think of ἀπιστούντος (Rutherford, who considered ἀπιστούντος . . . ὁμοίους an adscript) with some change in the order of words, but it would be said less well of the τις who put the question than of the Greeks in general.

41. 3. ἀμαθείς ὄντες . . . ληστέας.

ἀπαθείς has been conjectured, but Thucydides wrote ἀθελίς. Cf. 34. 2 ἀθελίσι τοιαύτης μάχης: 55. 4 τῆς πρὶν ἀθελίης τοῦ κακοπραγεῖν: 17. 4 οἱ ἀθελῶς τι ἀγαθὸν λαμβάνοντες.

50. 1. εἰς . . . στρατηγός again is no more good Greek than 'one general' for 'one of the generals' would in this case be good English. Rutherford ὁ for α', i.e. εἰς. We might simply omit εἰς or read στρατηγῶν.

55. 1. Read δούσιν for ὡς (cf. on 7. 28. 3), i.e. φρουρὰς διέπεμψαν ὀπλιτῶν (5. 31. 4) πλῆθος, δούσιν εἶδει.

ib. 2. μάλιστα δὲ ὀκνηρότεροι ἐγένοντο.

Remembering 5. 46. 1 ὡς ἐπὶ πλείστον ἄριστον εἶναι, 7. 42. 3 μάλιστα δεινотάτος ἐστι (Herod. 2. 76: Plato, *Tim.* 51 D and 92 B), and the frequent confusion of superlative with comparative endings, ought we not to restore ὀκνηρότατοι? Cf. on 32. 3.

65. 3. Εὐρυμέδοντα χρήματα ἐπράξαντο, ὡς . . . ἀποχωρήσειαν. Some participle seems wanted to introduce the latter clause, e.g. μεμφομένοι or ὀργισθέντες. Cf. 2. 70. 4 and Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1. 8 ζημιωθείς ἔφυγε· κατηγοροῦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ οἱ σύμμαχοι ὡς ἐφείη κ.τ.λ.



ib. 4. *χρώμενοι* gives no proper sense, but, slightly changed to *χρωμένοι*, it will do well enough, for it then becomes part of what they counted on with confidence.

67. 3. It has been seen that *ἀφανής* cannot be right and that *ἀμελής* or some such word is needed. I do not think it has been noticed that the error is due to *φαν* in *φανερῶ* just following. So Rutherford saw that *κατέχειν* in 92. 5 comes from *κατέσχον* two lines below.

71. 2. *ἔξειν*? Cf. on 3. 45. 7.

73. 4. The words *τοῖς δὲ ξυμπάσης . . . τολμᾶν* seem to me with one exception to give a fair sense, though they have been much pulled about by critics. *καὶ τῶν παρόντων* is another way of describing *ξύμπασα ἡ δύναμις*. We might omit *καί*, but there is no need. The pleonasm however of *κινδυνεύειν εἰκότως ἐθέλειν τολμᾶν*, where either *τολμᾶν* or *ἐθέλειν* is clearly superfluous, can hardly be endured. *ἐθέλοντες τολμᾶν* in 3. 56. 5 is not parallel, for there no *κινδυνεύειν* is added. I would read *εἰκότως ἔχειν τολμᾶν*, it was reasonable for them to venture on the risk. In Plato *Gorg.* 467 C I have pointed out (*Platonica*, p. 56) that *ἔχεις* should, as the answer shows, be *ἐθέλεις*.

Thucydides goes on *χρόνον δὲ ἐπισχόντες καὶ ὡς οὐδὲν ἀφ' ἐκατέρων ἐπεχειρεῖτο*, κ.τ.λ. The *καί* is impossible, though often defended, and may be a mere dittograph of *ὡς*, with which it is so often confounded. Cf. on 1. 25. 4.

78. 2. *καί . . . γε δὴ* can hardly be attached to the words before. Join it to what follows, reading *πᾶσιν* for *πᾶσι γε*. *γ* and *ν* sometimes exchange.

81. 1. The very unusual use of *γενόμενον*, referring to a time later than that of which the sentence is speaking, so that it is equivalent to *ὑστερον γενόμενον*, can be exactly paralleled from Herod. 7. 106. 1 *κατέλιπε δὲ ἄνδρα τοιοῦνδε Μασκάμην γενόμενον, τῷ μόνῳ κ.τ.λ.*, where *γενόμενον* belongs to a later time than *κατέλιπε*. Cf. (probably) 6. 72. 2, and Plut. *Phocion* 14, *προθυμοτάτους . . . γενομένους*; also 'Αθ. Πολ. 28. 3 *προειστίκει Νικίας ὁ ἐν Σικελίᾳ τελευτήσας*. In 112. 1 here the case is very different; see above.

84. 2. Possibly *ἀκούσαν* for *ἀκούσαντες* or *-τας*. The plural is very awkward with *δέχεται* closely following.

85. 2. *δόξης ἢ ἡλπίσαμεν κ.τ.λ.*

Greek rather likes an accusative (*ἦν*) in this kind of case. Plato *Rep.* 434 D (where *ἦ* has been conjectured) and 443 B *τὸ ἐνύπνιον ὃ ἔφαμεν ὑποπτεῖσθαι ὡς κ.τ.λ.*: *Soph.* 264 B *κατὰ τὴν προσδοκίαν ἦν ἐφαιβήθημεν*.

ib. 7. After 'they would not engage me at Nisaea, though they were numerous, so that—' the conclusion must be 'they are not likely to send here, and that on shipboard, a force no greater than (or not so great as) they had there.' Read *νῆϊτῃν* with Rutherford, but not his *στρατόν* or *ἰσοπαλῆ*. *στρατόν* is understood from *στρατῶ* (see next note) and *ἴσον* agrees with it, *πλήθος* being in *number*. Possibly <οὐκ> *ἴσον*, with the meaning that, coming by ship (*γε*), it was not likely to be even as great.

86. 5. The subject of *χαλεπωτέρα* is not *ἡ ἐλευθερία* but *ἡ ἀρχή*, at once implied in *δουλώσαιμι* and supplied from *τῆς ἀλλοφύλου ἀρχῆς*. Cf. 5. 9. 9. *δουλείαν χαλεπωτέραν ἢ πρὶν εἶχετε*. Such supplying is a regular Greek idiom, e.g. 5. 54. 2 *μετὰ τὸν μέλλοντα* (*Καρνεῖος δ' ἦν μὲν*): Plato *Laws* 785 B *εἴκοσι μέχρι τῶν τριάκοντα ἐτῶν* and *Ερ.* 7. 348 E *τῇ μετὰ ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν*: Eur. *Τρο.* 679 *οὐκ ἐλάσσω τῶν ἐμῶν ἔχει κακῶν*. So above in 85. 7 we can supply *στρατόν* with *νῆιτην*.

87. 2. Instead of *κακούμενοι διωθεῖσθαι* we should expect *διωθόμενοι κακούσθαι* (*suffer for rejecting*), but cf. 1. 85. 1 *ὠφελούμενοι ἔχομεν, ἐνjoy to our advantage*: 3. 37. 2 *ἐξ ὧν ἂν χαρίζησθε βλαπτόμενοι αὐτοί*.

92. 1. *ἐν ᾧ τε ἂν κ.τ.λ.* has been justly doubted. *τε* and *καί* make no sense. The latter should be either omitted (as having come from the line before or the line following) or placed after *ὅθεν*, and either *ᾧ ἂν* or *ὅτῳ ἂν* (Cobet) read in the former clause.

*ib.* 7. With *πατέρον . . . παῖδας* a *καί, τε, or ὄντας* is wanted.

94. 1. *πανστρατιᾶς . . . γενομένης*.

As only *πανστρατιᾶ* is ever found elsewhere, may we not insert *ἐξόδου*? In 2 on the other hand omit *τῶν Ἀθηναίων*.

96. 3. *ὑποχωρησάντων* γὰρ αὐτοῖς τῶν παρατεταγμένων καὶ κυκλωθέντων ἐν ὀλίγῳ οὔτε διεφθάρσαν Θεσπιῶν ἐν χερσὶν ἀμυνόμενοι κατεκόπησαν.

The irregular genitive *κυκλωθέντων* may be right, as in 73. 3 and 108. 1; but it may also well be due to *ὑποχωρησάντων*, the neighbourhood of which makes it very awkward. The nominative is more likely here.

*ὅπερ διεφθάρσαν* is certainly wrong. The sense required is not that the men who fell fell fighting, but that the Thespian contingent was destroyed to a man. Steup suggests *παρήσαν*, and, I think, rightly, but this is not all. *οἷπερ* also is the wrong word. Read not *οἷπερ*, *the very men who were present*, but *ὅσοιπερ*, *the entire number present* (2. 49. 6 *ὅσονπερ*); and add the strengthening, precision-giving *δή*. In this context *δὴ παρήσαν* might become *διεφθάρσαν* without much difficulty.

98. 8. *σπένδουσιν* is indefensible. *ποιοῦσιν* (i.e. *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ποιοῦσιν*) seems an admissible suggestion. The initial *σ* might come from the end of *νεκρούς*. In other places *ποιῶ* and *σκοπῶ* are certainly confused.

103. 4. *ὑποπτοι καὶ ἐπιβουλεύοντες*. Read *ὡς* for *καί*.

*ib.* 5. *ἀπέχει τὸ πόλισμα πλεόν τῆς διαβάσεως*.

These words have been found puzzling. I think that after *πλεόν* a certain distance was given, probably so many stades, which has been lost.

117. 2. Add this to the passages cited previously on 3. 38. 1, in which the *μὲν* clause, and not as usual the cl. use with *δέ*, is the main one. The sense is here 'they would lose the captives of Sphacteria, though they might get the best of it otherwise.' In 126. 4 and 6 *μὲν-δέ* is used twice in this way.

Probably we should adopt the suggested *πλείστου* for *πλέονος* (cf. on 34. 1) and *ῥως* for *ὡς*.

118. 5. *ῥσα δή?* Krueger doubted *ἂν*.

ib. 11. Write ὤμοσαν for ὠμολόγησαν, which means no more than ξυγχωροῦσι. In 119. 1 both readings are found.

132. 2. ὁ δὴ (not δὲ) Περδίκκας.

133. 3. ἔτη δὲ ἡ Χρυσὶς τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε ἐπέλαβεν ὁκτὼ καὶ ἑνατον ἐκ μέσου ὅτε ἐπεφεύγει.

ἐπεφεύγει cannot be right for at the time of her flight. Herwerden ἔφυγε, Herde ἀπέφυγε. When we consider the sentence, we see that ἐπέλαβεν cannot well be right either, even if an aorist is adopted in the other case. Such a construction as εἶδεν ὅτε ἦλθεν occurs hundreds of times in Greek, and it always means *he saw on coming*, not *he saw before coming*. ἐπέλαβεν ὅτε ἐπεφεύγει (or ἔφυγε) can never have been used to express this inverted relation of time, *had reached when she (had) fled*. ἐπέλαβε πρὸ τοῦ φεύγειν would be natural enough, but not ἐπέλαβεν ὅτε ἐπεφεύγει, which any Greek would have understood to mean *reached when she was in exile (flight)*. We have then an aorist which would naturally be a pluperfect and a pluperfect which would naturally be an aorist. Is it too bold to think that the verbs have by error exchanged their forms, and that we should read ἐπειλήφει . . . ὅτε ἔφυγε (ἀπέφυγε) or ὅτε ἔφυγε . . . ἐπειλήφει? Cf. on 10. 3.

H. RICHARDS.

WADHAM COLLEGE,  
OXFORD.

(To be continued.)

## AENEAS TACTICVS AND STICHOMETRY.

THESE notes are the result of some work done a year or two ago on the Medicean MS. of Aeneas Tacticus<sup>1</sup> (*Cod. Mediceus Laurentianus*, Plut. Iv. 4, Saec. xi.) in preparation for an edition of that unduly neglected author which I hope will soon see the light. I should not have thought it worth while to publish them separately were it not for two papers, at once laborious and brilliant, read by Mr. A. C. Clark to the Oxford Philological Society on the text of Cicero's speeches, in May, 1912, and February, 1913. The extreme plausibility with which the reader then explained numberless corruptions, transpositions, etc., in the text of Cicero, by reconstructing the length of line and pagination of the MSS. in their several degrees of descent, led me to think that it might be of some interest to publish the results at which I arrived by working on the same lines with a Greek author. In my case the problem has been a far simpler one, as I only had one MS. to deal with;<sup>2</sup> but as I came to my own conclusions quite independently, before I knew that the method was being applied elsewhere, I give them for what they are worth, only too glad to find myself in such good company.

The text of Aeneas, as represented by M, teems with corruptions of every possible sort; but undoubtedly the most noticeable peculiarity is a tendency to omit words, or parts of words, where the scribe's eye has passed to a similar termination or collocation of letters further on.

Clear cases are to be found e.g. in—

ἄλλην for ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην (c. xxii. 12).

ἐλθόντες for ἔλαθον ἐπεξελθόντες (c. xxiii. 4).

ἕως ἀνέφυσαν αἱ τρίχες τάχιστα for ἕως ἀνέφυσαν αἱ τρίχες· ὥς δὲ ἀνέφυσαν τάχιστα (c. xxxi. 28, cf. Hdt. v. 35).

πρὸς τάδε for πρὸς τὸ δάπεδον (c. xxxvii. 6, cf. Hdt. iv. 200).

Similar lipography is probably to be found in the following passages:

ἔξω for ἐν Νάξῳ (c. xxii. 20).

κατέλαβε Κλαζομενὰς ἐν ταῖς πυλαῖς τῶν ἁμαξῶν· for κατέλαβε Κλαζομενὰς μενουσὸν ἐν ταῖς πυλαῖς τῶν ἁμαξῶν (c. xxviii. 5).

ἔπλα οἰσοῖν for ἔπλα, πλήθος οἰσῶν (c. xxix. 11) (\* placed above indicates corruption).

βρόχον καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς for βρόχον ἔχοντα τὰς ἀρχὰς (c. xviii. 9) (καὶ was inserted later to patch up the sense).

<sup>1</sup> The best text of Aeneas to use for reference is Teubner's latest edition (R. Schöne, 1911), which adheres far more closely to the text of M

than the earlier edition by Hug, 1874.

<sup>2</sup> The other MSS. of Aeneas are all late apographs of M.

This  
thing ma  
began or  
some MS  
seems to  
and so on

The  
26, an an  
Hdt. viii.

Hdt.

Aen.

Her  
word, m  
unfamiliar

The  
There is  
scribe wa  
mark ' v  
Köchly  
merely p  
conjectu  
this is m  
to sugges

If w  
but ἄλλ  
παρὰ Τυ  
but the f  
that the

In r  
some MS  
obviousl  
perhaps

<sup>1</sup> ὅτε αὖ  
<sup>2</sup> γλυφί  
<sup>3</sup> παρὰ  
an incline

This being the case, it struck me as reasonable to suppose that the same thing may have happened in the case of *whole lines*, where the next line either began or ended with a similar word or series of letters:—viz., that the writer of some MS. from which M is directly descended (not I think M itself, which seems to have been a very careful copy) let his eye stray to the line next below, and so omitted to copy a whole line.

The passage which first drew my attention to this possibility was c. xxxi. 26, an anecdote relating to the siege of Potidaea, where Aeneas is quoting from Hdt. viii. 128. The passages run respectively as follows:

*Hdt. loc. cit.* ὅκως βυβλίον γράψει ἡ Τιμόξεινος ἐθέλων παρὰ Ἀρτάβαζον πέμψαι ἢ Ἀρτάβαζος παρὰ Τιμόξεινον, τοξέυματος περὶ τὰς γλυφίδας περιελίξαντες καὶ πετέρωσαντες τὸ βυβλίον ἐτόξευον ἐς συγκείμενον χωρίον.

*Aen. loc. cit.* (M.). Ποτίδαιαν γὰρ θέλων προδοῦναι Τιμόξεινος Ἀρταβάζῳ προσυνέθεντο ἀλλήλοις ὁ μὲν τῆς πύλεως τι χωρίον ὃ δὲ τοῦ στρατοπέδου εἰς ὅπερ ἐτόξευον. ὅτι ἀντι<sup>1</sup> ἤθελον ἀλλήλοις ἐμφανίσαι . . . (spatium trium litterarum) αἶξετο δὲ τοῦ τοξέυματος περὶ τὰς πύλας γλυφὰς<sup>2</sup> ἐλίσξαντες τὸ βυβλίον καὶ πετέρωσαντες ἐτόξευον εἰς τὰ προσυγκείμενα χωρία.

Here Aeneas, as is his wont, is following his original almost word for word, making only slight changes where the language of Herodotus is unfamiliar to his readers (e.g. ὅτε for ὅκως, Τιμόξεινος for Τιμόξεινος.)

The reading of M αἶξετο δέ has never yet been satisfactorily explained. There is a gap after ἐμφανίσαι at the end of the line in M, indicating that the scribe was puzzled, and thought that something had dropped out; and the usual mark <sup>ε</sup> was added above αἶξετο to call attention to corruption. Rüstow and Köchly (Leipzig, 1853, p. 122) put τότε in their text for αἶξετο δε, but this merely patches up the sense without explaining the corruption. They also conjecture in the margin ἀζητήτως, 'in an unexamined way,' i.e. secretly; but this is more than doubtful Greek, not to say that there is nothing in Herodotus to suggest it.

If we look again at Aeneas' original, we find that there is nothing in M but ἀλλήλοις to correspond with ἡ Τιμόξεινος παρὰ Ἀρτάβαζον ἢ Ἀρτάβαζος παρὰ Τιμόξεινον. Under ordinary circumstances this would arouse no suspicion, but the fact that the corrupt letters in M are αἶξετο gives a strong presumption that the corruption has something to do with the name Ἀρτάβαζος.

In my opinion the only clue to the passage is to suppose that a line in some MS. from which M has descended has dropped out altogether. αἶξετο is obviously the termination of some passive verb, either παρεσκευάζετο,<sup>3</sup> or perhaps better ἐτεχνάζετο, a favourite word of Aeneas in this connection

<sup>1</sup> ὅτε αὖν γ. Rüstow and Köchly (Leipzig, 1853).

<sup>2</sup> γλυφίδας ex Hdt. Casaubon.

<sup>3</sup> παρεσκευάζετο was my own suggestion; but I am inclined to accept Hermann Schöne's con-

jecture ἐτεχνάζετο (in App. Crit. of R. Schöne's edition of Aeneas Tacticus, Teubner, Lipsa, 1911, p. 90), for the reason stated above. Palaeographically, both are equally acceptable.

(Cf. ii. 3. τεχνάζουσιν . . . τοιονδε; x. 21, τεχνάζει δὲ τοιονδε; 25, τοιονδε τεχνάζουσι; xi. 13, ἐτεχνάσθη τοιονδε, etc., etc. It occurs, in all, nine times.)

I suggest that the Archetype ran approximately as follows:

ΟΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΤΙ ΗΘΕΛΟΝ ΑΔΔΗΛΟΙΣ ΕΜΦΑΝΙΣΤΑΙ Η ΑΡΤΑ  
ΒΑΖΩΙ ΤΙΜΟΞΕΝΟΣ Η ΤΙΜΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΑΡΤΑΒΑΖΩΙ ΕΤΕΧ (37 letters)  
ΝΑΖΕΤΟ ΤΟΔΕ ΤΟΥ ΤΟΞΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑς ΤΑΥΦΙΔΑς.

i.e. the scribe of the MS. from which M is descended, misled by the similar series of letters at the beginning of two successive lines, omitted the first and went straight on to the second. (In a minuscule hand the resemblance between βαζ and ναζ would be very close.<sup>1</sup>) The scribe who next followed could make no sense of 'Αρτα | ναζετο τοδε as it stood, and saw no reason for introducing Artabazus' name again: so he left it out with a space to mark the omission and copied what was left; the alteration of ναζετο to αζετο may be accounted for by the fact that αζετο is a Greek word, while ναζετο is a *vox nihili*: and the το- of τόδε naturally dropped out after αζετο.<sup>2</sup>

But, one may well ask, is there the faintest reason for supposing that our Archetype was written in lines approximately of this length—i.e. 36-40 letters to the line? And again, are there other passages in which we can apply the same theory with satisfactory results? To both these questions I hope to show that the answer is in the affirmative.

First, as to whether the lines of the Archetype contained roughly an average of 37 letters to the line?

In itself it makes a line of quite a reasonable length:<sup>3</sup> but there are also passages in Aeneas where corruption of one line from another has obviously taken place, and where a line of this length will give us the most probable conditions for such corruption, i.e., the occurrence of a similar series of letters in a similar position in two successive lines.

I. In c. xxviii. 7, M runs as follows:

δοκεῖ δέ μοι συναγαγόντι δηλωτέον ἵνα δὴ φυλάσσησθε καὶ ἐν οἷς καιροῖς  
ἕκαστα, ἵνα τις μὴδὲν εὐθὺς ἀποδέχηται.

This has been either removed as an interpolation, or stigmatized as hopelessly corrupt. Yet a comparatively simple emendation restores good sense, viz., εἶναι ἃ δεῖ φυλάσσεσθαι for ἵνα δὴ φυλάσσησθε. Given the corruption of ἃ to ἵνα the rest explains itself. But how did this corruption arise? Simply from the fact that εἶναι ἃ and ἵνα occupied similar positions in two successive lines.

<sup>1</sup> I had at first written 'Αρταβ | ἀζω Τυμάξουσι + Τυμάξουσι 'Αρταβάζω τετεχ | ἀζω. But though this division of 'Αρταβάζω after the consonant might be permissible in an uncial MS. (see Wattenbach, *Anleitung zur Griech. Palaeographie*, Leipzig, 1895, p. 15), in a minuscule hand it would, I believe, be unexampled (id. ib., p. 58). In either case the line is of the same length.

<sup>2</sup> The other corruption of γλυφίδας into the meaningless πιδας γλυφίδας is not hard to explain,

as γλυφίδας is a rare word. The stages were probably (i) ΓΑΤΦΙΔΑς (ii) ΓΑΤΦΑς, to which was added in the margin the conjecture ΠΤΑΑς. (iii) This afterwards crept into the text as an addition to ΓΑΤΦΑς instead of an alternative, giving the reading of M as we have it now.

<sup>3</sup> The Archetype of Thucydides has, I believe, been reconstructed on an average of 35 letters to the line: that of Demosthenes on an average of from 37 to 33.

The original ran somehow in this form (though of course we cannot say where in the line the words in question occur):

ΑΟΚΕΙ ΔΕ ΜΟΙ CΥΝΑΓΑΓΟΝΤΙ ΔΗΛΩΤΕΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ Α  
ΔΕΙ ΦΥΛΑCCECΘΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΟΙC ΚΑΙΡΟΙC ΕΚΑCΤΑ ΙΝΑ (38 letters).

2. Another passage, c. xxii. 17, is still more conclusive as to confusion between successive lines. This passage runs in M:

περὶ γὰρ τὰς ἑορτὰς τοὺς τοιοῦτους καιροὺς μάλιστα οἱ βουλόμενοί τι νεωτερίζειν ἐγχειροῦσιν· ὅσα δὲ πάθρα γέγονεν περὶ τοῦ στοιχείου τοὺς καιροὺς ἐν ἄλλοις δηλοῦται.

Here there are two things to explain:

1. τοὺς τοιοῦτους καιροὺς, which will not stand where it is in M.

2. περὶ τοῦ στοιχείου τοὺς καιροὺς, which is nonsense.

Obviously what Aeneas said was:

περὶ γὰρ τὰς ἑορτὰς μάλιστα οἱ βουλόμενοί τι νεωτερίζειν ἐγχειροῦσιν· ὅσα δὲ πάθρα γέγονεν περὶ τοὺς τοιοῦτους καιροὺς ἐν ἄλλοις δηλοῦται.

Arrange this in lines of the length suggested. We get something like this:

ΠΕΡΙ ΓΑΡ ΤΑC ΕΟΡΤΑC

1. ΜΑΛΙCΤΑ ΟΙ ΒΟΥΛΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΤΙ ΝΕΩΤΕΡΙΖΕΙΝ ΕΓΧΕΙ (37 letters).

2. ΡΟΥCΙΝ· ΟCΑ ΔΕ ΠΑΘΡΑ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥC ΤΟΙΟΥ (37 letters).  
ΤΟΥC ΚΑΙΡΟΥC.

Now the scribe who copied this, when he reached the end of the second completed line, let his eye wander inadvertently to the line above, and took in *χει* after *τοι*, thus writing *του στοιχείου* and then going straight on to the next line *τοὺς καιροὺς* without noticing his mistake. The correction *τοὺς τοιοῦτους καιροὺς* was then made in the margin, but afterwards the copyist of the next MS. in the line of descent (possibly M itself) mistook the correction for a mere omission and copied it into the text after *περὶ τὰς ἑορτὰς* as the most likely place near.

There are at least two other passages where it seems probable that a similar corruption has occurred, and where it is very easily explained on the supposition that the lines were of this length.

3. In c. xxxiii. § 2, M reads *παρεσκευάσθω ξύλα οἷον ὑπερμεγέθη<sup>1</sup> δὲ πολλῶ μείζω· καὶ εἰς μὲν τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ ξύλου κρούσαι σιδήρια ὀξεῖα καὶ μείζω.*

Here *καὶ μείζω* at the end makes no sort of sense: the *σιδήρια* cannot possibly be bigger than the *ξύλα*. *μείζω* is obviously an unintentional repetition from *πολλῶ μείζω* above, and if we rewrite the passage in lines of the length suggested we at once see the explanation. The result will be something like this:

ΠΑΡΕCΚΕΥΑ

CΘΩ ΕΥΛΑ ΟΙΟΝ ΥΠΕΡΑ ΜΕΤΕΘΕΙ ΔΕ ΠΟΛΛΑ ΜΕΙΖΩ ΚΑΙ (38 letters).

ΕΙC ΜΕΝ ΤΑ ΑΚΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΛΟΥ ΚΡΟΥCΑΙ CΙΔΗΡΙΑ ΟΞΕΑ (38 letters).

The scribe's eye on finishing the second line has been caught by *καὶ μείζω* at the end of the line above, and he has copied them in after *ὀξεῖα*.

<sup>1</sup> *ὑπερὰ μεγέθει*, Rüstow and Köchly.



How easy it is to do this inadvertently when tired of one's work and confused every one will admit.

4. In c. xl. 3, M reads:

ἦν δὲ μείζων (sc. ἡ πόλις) ἣ ὥστε ἵπ' ὀλίγων φυλάσσεσθαι· ἐπιμελητὰς μὲν οὖν τινὰς μετ' ὀλίγων οὐς ἐνεδέχετο, τῶν δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει τὰ μέγιστα δυναμένους οἰκέτας<sup>1</sup> συνῴκισεν τῶν δεσποτῶν τὰς θυγατέρας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ ἀδελφάς.

Here a principal verb is obviously wanted in the sentence ἐπιμελητὰς . . . ἐνεδέχετο; ἐπέστησε, κατέλιπε, κατέστησε, ἐγκατέστησε have been suggested by various editors. But no explanation of the omission is forthcoming. Our suggestion is that μετ' ὀλίγων has in reality displaced *some verb the letters of which resembled it* (the nearest being obviously μετέλιπεν), the confusion arising from ἵπ' ὀλίγων in the line above.

If we attempt to reconstruct the arrangement of lines as before, we get something of this sort.

HN ΔΕ ΜΕΙΖΩΝ Η ὍΣΤΕ ΥΠ' ΟΛΙΓΩΝ ΦΥΛΑΣΣΕΘΑΙ· ΕΠΙ (37)  
ΜΕΛΗΤΑΙ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΤΙΝΑΣ ΜΕΤΕΛΙΠΕΝ ΟΥΣ ΕΝΕΔΕΧΕΤΟ (39).

In any rearrangement on this principle the words ἵπ' ὀλίγων will be almost immediately above μετέλιπεν; and this would make the corruption of μετέλιπεν to μετ' ὀλίγων (M) a very simple process.

I hope I have now established a reasonable presumption that the lines of our Archetype contained approximately this number of letters (a number between 36 and 40, allowing for the different sizes of letters and possible spaces between sentences, is not unreasonable). And now I come to the second question, viz.: Are there any other passages in which the same presumption can be acted upon with a view to further emending our text?

First, there are some cases in which transposition is clearly necessary, where our theory works exceedingly well.

1. In c. xxvii. 2, M reads:

προσυγκείσθαι τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει σημεῖα δ' ἰδόντες γινώσκονται γινώσκονται δὲ ὅτι ἐστὶν πάνειον ἔστω δὲ αἰσθήσονται πυρός τι προσυγκείμενον ἐπὶ χείρου ἐκκατόπτου<sup>2</sup> πᾶσιν εἰς δύναμιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει.

This as it stands is sheer nonsense. I have emended as follows:

προσυγκείσθαι τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει σημεῖα, ἃ ἰδόντες γινώσκονται, αἰσθήσονται δὲ ὅτι ἐστὶν πάνειον· ἔστω δὲ πυρός τι προσυγκείμενον ἐπὶ χωρίου εὐκατόπτου κ.τ.λ.

That is, I have assumed that αἰσθήσονται has been misplaced, and that its proper place is that taken by the second γινώσκονται.—'They will see the signals and recognize them, and perceive that there is a panic.'

How did this happen?

Perhaps the Archetype ran thus:

CHMEIA A ΙΑΟΝΤΕΣ ΓΝΩ  
CONTAI ΓΝΩCONTAI ΔΕ ΟΤΙ ΕCΤΙΝ ΠΑΝΕΙΟΝ, ΕCΤΩ ΔΕ (38 letters).  
† αἰσθήσονται ΠΥΡΟΣ ΤΙ ΠΡΟΣΥΓΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΠΙ ΧΩΡΙΟΥ ΕΥΚΑΤΟΠ  
ΤΟΥ

<sup>1</sup> δυναμένων οἰκέτας RK.

<sup>2</sup> εὐκατόπτου, Cas.

i.e. the scribe copied *γνώσονται* twice, and the correction put in in the margin was regarded as an omission, and naturally copied in at the beginning of the next line instead (cf. p. 259 on c. xxii. 17).

2. In c. xxix. 4, M reads:

πρώτον μὲν τοῖς προενδημήσασι ξένοις ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον καὶ πολιτῶν τοῖς ἀνόπλοις τε καὶ συνεργοῖς ἐσομένοις εἰσεκομίσθησαν θώρακες κ.τ.λ.

Here, though the order of the words is rather unusual, there is nothing at first sight to provoke suspicion, if we take ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον closely with *προενδημήσασι*. But fortunately we have Julius Africanus<sup>1</sup> to check our text by, and we find on reference to him (Κεστοί, c. 50):

τοῖς ἀφ' ἧμῶν ἐκεῖσε προενδημοῦσι ξένοις καὶ προδόταις ὡς εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἡμῖν συμπράττουσιν εἰσεκομίζεσθαι δεῖ θώρακας κ.τ.λ.

Not a very close resemblance, it is true. Julius Africanus often modifies the language of his original. But the one thing that is certain is that the MS. from which he was copying had its words so arranged that ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον must be taken not with *προενδημήσασι* but with *συνεργοῖς ἐσομένοις*.

Arranging the words in their natural order, we find that Aeneas wrote:

τοῖς προενδημήσασι ξένοις καὶ πολιτῶν τοῖς ἀνόπλοις τε καὶ συνεργοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον ἐσομένοις κ.τ.λ.

How did the transposition occur? It is not very difficult to see.

The intermediate stage was probably—

ΤΟΙΣ ΠΡΟΕΝΔΗΜΗΘΕΑΣΙ ΞΕΝΟΙΣ  
ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΝΟΠΛΟΙΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΝΕΡΓΟΙΣ (36) *ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον*  
ΕΣΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ

i.e. ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον was left out at the end of one line, added in the margin, and afterwards taken into the text *at the end of the line above*.

3. Let us take another case where we have the help of Julius Africanus.

In c. xxxi. 32, M reads:

πολλοὶ δὲ κατ' ἡπείρου κυσὶν ἐχρήσαντο ὧδε· ἀπαγαγόντες δεσμὸν· περιέθηκαν περὶ τὸν αὔχένα ἰμάντα, ἐν ᾧ ἐπιστολὴ ἐγγεγραπτο<sup>2</sup>. εἶτα ἀφήκαν νυκτὸς ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν κ.τ.λ.

Julius Africanus reads (Κεστοί, 53):

κυνὶ δεσμὸν τεθεικότες περὶ τὸν αὔχένα ἐνέβαλον τοῦ ἰμάτος ἔσωθεν ἐπιστολὴν νυκτὸς· τοῦτον ἀφήκαν μεθ' ἡμέραν κ.τ.λ.

Here M's νυκτὸς ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν is utterly pointless,<sup>3</sup> and Julius Africanus shows that the order of words in the MS. from which he was copying, whatever it was, was certainly *not* that of M. The point is, of course, that the dog was brought in and the letter inserted in its collar *by night*, and the animal left to find its way home *next morning*. It is difficult to decide exactly where νυκτὸς should be inserted in the first clause. But to place it after αὔχένα certainly accounts for the transposition more simply than any other arrangement.

<sup>1</sup> A Christian Bishop of the 3rd century A.D. who took excerpts from Aeneas into his *Kestoi*, a miscellaneous note-book containing scraps of information on every possible subject.

<sup>2</sup> Read *ἐγγεγραπτο* (Cas.).

<sup>3</sup> It probably arose from the fact that the same phrase occurs elsewhere in the treatise (cf. cc. xxvii. 1, xxxix. 6, where it makes good sense).

The first stage of corruption may have been :

ΑΠΛΑ

ΓΑΓΟΝΤΕC ΔΕCΜΟΝ ΠΕΡΙΕΘΗΚΑΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΥΧΕΝΑ  
νυκτός ΙΜΑΝΤΑ ΕΝ ΟΙ ΕΠΙCΤΟΛΗC ΕΝΕΡΡΑΠΤΟ· ΕΙΤΑ ΔΦΗΚΑΝ (37)  
 ΜΕΘ' ΗΜΕΡΑΝ . . .

i.e. *νυκτός* was omitted (possibly after *περίεθηκαν*, more probably after *αύχενα*), added in the margin, and afterwards inserted at the beginning of the *next* line. When that occurred, *ἡ* had to be inserted before *μεθ' ἡμέραν* to give an appearance of sense to the passage, though in reality it destroys the point of the anecdote altogether.

4. In yet another case where transposition seems necessary, the arrangement in lines of the length suggested works out particularly well, though it is not essential to the proper emendation of the passage.

In c. xviii. 13, M gives :

συμβάλλεται γενέσθαι Τημένω Ῥοδίῳ ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ· Τέως πόλις εὐμεγέθης προει-  
 δότος ὑπὸ τοῦ πυλωροῦ.

We are not here concerned with the emendation of *συμβάλλεται*, which is very likely corrupt (see Editions *ad loc.*). But with regard to the rest of the sentence, Hug and others have seen that the simplest restoration is to suppose that *ὑπὸ* has been misplaced and to transpose it back to its natural place before *Τημένω*, as the genitive absolute *προειδότης τοῦ πυλωροῦ* is complete without it. *γίγνεσθαι* is not found with the dative alone in the sense of 'come under the power of' (see E. C. Marchant's note on Thuc. vii. 49. 1); but *γίγνεσθαι ὑπὸ* with dative is a well-attested construction in Herodotus and Thucydides (e.g. Thuc. vii. 64. 1).

If we suppose that the first stage of corruption was

ΚΥΜΒΑΛΛΕΤΑΙ ΓΕΝΕCΘΑΙ ΤΗΜΕΝΩΙ ΡΟΔΙΩΙ  
 ΕΝ ΙΩΝΙΑΙ ΤΕΩC ΠΟΛΙC ΕΥΜΕΓΕΘΗC ΠΡΟΕΙΔΟΤΟC (36) *ὑπὸ*  
 ΤΟΥ ΠΥΛΩΡΟΥ

the explanation is simple enough.

Secondly, there are a few cases where no transposition can be relied upon to restore the sense, and it is obvious that some word or words have been omitted. Here I should like to suggest the possibility of a *whole line* having dropped out.

1. In c. xxviii. 3, M gives the following nonsense :

καὶ ἐάν τι δέῃ εἰσενέγκασθαι σίτου ἢ ἐλαίου ἢ οἶνου ἐν τάχει ἢ τῶν ὁμοτρόπων  
 τούτοις ἀμάξαις ἢ σωμάτων πάθῃ, ταῦτα δὲ χρή κατὰ τὰς ἐγγυτάτας πύλας  
 κοιμίζειν καὶ ἐὰν τάχιστα καὶ ῥᾶστα εἰσκομισθεῖν.

Here, again, Julius Africanus gives some assistance. He reads (Κεστοί, 49):  
 εἰ δέ τι τούτων ἀναγκαίως δεήσει δι' ἀμαξῶν εἰσκομίζεσθαι σίτου ἢ οἶνου ἢ  
 ἐλαίου ἢ τῶν τοιούτων τι σωμάτων πλήθει ταῦτα εἰσκομίζεσθαι δεῖ προεξιώντος  
 στρατεύματος.

Note (1) that he supports the obvious corrections *πλήθει* for *πάθῃ*, and  
*κομίζειν* for *κοιμίζειν*;

(2) that he places in an emphatic position *προεξίντος στρατεύματος*. Now, while nothing corresponding to these words is preserved in M, some reservation of this sort is almost essential to give a good sense to the passage. It is practically certain that some words have been omitted in M which (i.) correspond to *προεξίντος στρατεύματος*; (ii.) supply a construction for the latter part of the sentence *ἐάν* . . . *εἰσκομσθείη* (*ἐάν* is obviously corrupt). Of course we cannot restore with any certainty; but it seems quite possible that what Aeneas originally wrote was

ΤΑΥΤΑ  
ΔΕ ΧΡΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΣ ΕΓΓΥΤΑΤΑΣ ΠΥΛΑΣ ΚΟΜΙΖΕΙΝ ΚΑΙ  
< ΠΡΟΕΞΙΝΤΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΥΛΩΝ ΣΤΡΑΤΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΟΥΤΩ ΓΑΡ > (38)  
ΑΝ ΤΑΧΙΣΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΡΑΙΣΤΑ ΕΙΣΚΟΜΙΣΘΕΙΗ.

The form of the sentence *οὕτω γὰρ ἂν* . . . is exactly in Aeneas' style;<sup>1</sup> the omission is supplied, and the defective construction naturally accounted for.

2. We now come to a passage which has been the despair of editors; the account of 'the exceeding secret but exceeding laborious device' for sending messages given by Aeneas in c. xxxi. 16-20.

In c. xxxi. 17-18, M reads:

*ἀσπράγαλον εὐμεγέθη τρυπήσαι εἴκοσι καὶ τέτταρα, ἕξ εἰς ἐκάστην πλευρὰν τοῦ ἀσπράγαλου· ἔστω δὲ τὰ τρυπήματα τοῦ ἀσπράγαλου δ' ἀφ' ἧς ἂν πλευρᾶς ἄρξῃ τὸ ἄλφα, καὶ τὰ ἐχόμενα ἄπερ ἐν ἐκάστη πλευρᾷ γέγραπται.*

Julius Africanus reads (Κεστοί, 52):

*ἀσπράγαλον εὐμεγέθη δεῖ σὲ τρυπήσαι τρυπήματα κδ' ἕξ ὧν εἰς ἐκάστην πλευρὰν τοῦ ἀσπράγαλου· ἔστω δὲ τὰ τρυπήματα στοιχεῖα· διαμνημόνευε δὲ ἀφ' ἧς ἂν πλευρᾶς ἄρξῃται τὸ ἄλφα, καὶ τὰ ἐχόμενα ἄπερ ἐν ἐκάστη πλευρᾷ γέγραπται.*

As sometimes occurs, Julius Africanus, while on the whole more corrupt than M, gives us the clue to the right reading. So here it seems reasonable (i.) to insert *τρυπήματα* after *τρυπήσαι* in M; (ii.) to suppose that M had something to correspond to *διαμνημόνευε δέ*; it is, indeed, almost necessary, to complete the construction of the latter part of the sentence. The *δ* in M is useless as it stands (as a numeral), but on the hypothesis that a whole line has dropped out can be easily explained. What originally stood in the MS. from which both M and Julius Africanus are derived was probably

ΑΣΤΡΑΓΑΛΟΝ ΕΥΜΕΓΕΘΗ ΤΡΥΠΗΣΑΙ ΤΡΥΠΗΜΑΤΑ

1. ΕΙΚΟCΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΤΤΑΡΑ ΕΞ ΕΙC ΕΚΑCΤΗΝ ΠΛΕΥΡΑΝ ΤΟΥ (38)
2. ΑΣΤΡΑΓΑΛΟΥ· ΕCΤΩ ΔΕ ΤΑ ΤΡΥΠΗΜΑΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΣΤΡΑΓΑΛΟΥ (40) or perhaps (38)<sup>2</sup>
3. < ΤΑ ΕΙΚΟCΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΤΤΑΡΑ CΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ· ΔΙΑΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΕ > (38)
4. ΔΕ ΑΦ' ΗC ΑΝ ΠΛΕΥΡΑC ΑΡΞΗΤΑΙ ΤΟ ΑΛΦΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ (38)  
ΑΠΕΡ ΕΝ ΕΚΑCΤΗ ΠΛΕΥΡΑΙ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ.

Omit line 3 (and notice that it begins with nearly the same series of letters as line 1), and we have the *exact reading now preserved by M* (with the exception of *δε* for *δ*, a negligible difference). The insertion of *τὰ εἴκοσι καὶ*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. iii. 6., xiii. 4 (*οὕτω γὰρ ἂν τάχιστα* . . .),  
xxiv. 16, xxviii. 2 (*οὕτω γὰρ ἂν ἤκιστα* . . .).

<sup>2</sup> With abbreviation ~ for *ov* at end of line.

τέτταρα στοιχεῖα completes the sense admirably, and Julius Africanus' στοιχεῖα goes to support it: and διαμνημόνευε, an emphatic word, 'remember thoroughly,' exactly fills up the line, while supplying the verb needed to govern τὰ ἐχόμενα. Translate 'and be careful to remember as well (καί), counting from the side, whichever it is (ἂν) ᾗς ἂν', on which the A begins, the exact (ἄπερ) letters following which occur on each side in turn.'

If this is mere coincidence, it must be admitted that it is little short of marvellous.

The instances I have given above have, I hope, by this time convinced the reader that there is something to be gained by working on these lines. Indeed, in dealing with Aeneas it is hardly too much to say that it proved for me an 'Open Sesamé'; for, whether in dealing with ordinary corruptions, cases of transposition, or wholesale omissions, it has this great advantage, that it affords a coherent solution of the whole problem instead of a series of guesses, which, however brilliant, are usually haphazard. It is unfortunate that we have not the least means of deciding at what period in the tradition these corruptions took place. It is certain that the text of Aeneas was in a very bad state when it came into the hands of Julius Africanus. On the other hand, it is equally certain from his quotations that several of the words now missing in M were still preserved in the text which he used. A margin of variation of as many as five letters in a line (36-40) does not seem unreasonable, to allow for variation in size of letters, spaces left for purposes of punctuation, occasional abbreviation at the end of a line (the only form of abbreviation found in M), and either adscription or omission in the case of 'subscript.' If it be objected that I have overworked a willing horse, the answer will be that my hypothesis showed a willingness to respond to the demands made on it which I could hardly have dared to expect.

L. W. HUNTER.

NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD.

T  
IN  
argues a  
social st  
of the in  
plan of  
and So  
ready-m  
Republic  
of his o  
the Ide  
and rea  
answer,  
of State  
Th  
the trip  
princip  
very ea  
classifi  
In  
of a po  
children  
seems c  
as mod  
that he  
evidenc  
σωφροσ  
certainl  
virtue o  
to argu  
lowest  
his whe  
the me

<sup>1</sup> Class  
268.

## THE MODIFICATION OF PLAN IN PLATO'S *REPUBLIC*.

IN a recent number<sup>1</sup> of the *Classical Quarterly* Mr. F. M. Cornford argues against the commonly accepted view, according to which the tripartite social structure of the *Republic* is a corollary, in Plato's mind, to the tripartition of the individual Soul. In the present paper I propose to examine the general plan of the dialogue, in the hope of showing that Plato's conceptions of State and Soul were not, as generally assumed and as assumed by Mr. Cornford, ready-made and clearly formulated in his mind before he began to write the *Republic*: that, on the contrary, we can detect profound and vital modifications of his original views as the argument proceeds: and that the conceptions of the Ideal State and the rightly constituted human soul grow out of one another and react on one another in such a way that it is impossible to give a simple answer, affirmative or negative, to the question 'Which is prior, the tripartition of State or the tripartition of Soul?'

The main argument advanced by Mr. Cornford in favour of his belief, that the tripartition of State or social structure is prior, is that it is based on a principle of political and social classification familiar to Greek thought from very early times, a principle which may be roughly described as that of classification by age.

In the account of *σωφροσύνη* in *Rep.* 430D-432A Mr. Cornford finds traces of a popular representation of that virtue as 'the special virtue of women and children—in a word, those who are not adult male citizens, or *ἄνδρες*.'<sup>2</sup> It seems clear from his previous distinction of the different aspects of *σωφροσύνη* as mode of behaviour, aspects corresponding to the three Platonic Classes, that he is only referring to what he terms *σωφροσύνη ἀλόγιστος*. But does the evidence which he adduces suffice even to establish that this conception of *σωφροσύνη ἀλόγιστος* was at the back of Plato's mind? That evidence certainly shows that *σωφροσύνη* was commonly looked upon as the peculiar virtue of *παῖδες* and *γυναῖκες* as opposed to *ἄνδρες*: but surely it is unjustifiable to argue that, because Plato includes *παῖδες* and *γυναῖκες* here amongst the lowest class, he is starting from this popular conception. For it is clear from his whole argument that women and children are included quite incidentally: the members of the lowest class who are important for the argument are the

<sup>1</sup> *Classical Quarterly*, October, 1912, pp. 246-268.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 252.

δημιουργοὶ καὶ γέωργοι. Mr. Cornford evades this point by saying that 'the ranking of the mass of the uneducated in this third class is a characteristic of the Platonic State as contrasted (for instance) with the Athenian. We may therefore<sup>1</sup> leave . . . the masses out of account': he implies in these words that the persons who are uppermost in Plato's mind, and with whom he starts in his constitution of the lowest class, are women and children, and that the inclusion of the 'mass of the uneducated' is a subsequent idea; whereas, in point of fact, Plato surely starts with the notion of the Artisans and Farmers as constituting his lowest class, and adds Women and Children subsequently.

Thus we may fairly say that there is a trace, in this passage, of the popular conception of *σωφροσύνη* alluded to by Mr. Cornford; but it has little importance for Plato's threefold classification, and is certainly not the ultimate principle on which that classification is based.

If this be so, it follows that a political structure based on difference of age is not what led Plato to his tripartition of State, and indirectly of Soul. The fact that there is a distinction of age between the Auxiliaries and the Rulers, that *ἀνδρεία* is regarded as characteristic of the former as being younger men, and *σοφία* or *εὐβουλία* of the latter as being older, is of little moment, though doubtless it does imply Plato's acceptance of the common supposition that wisdom comes with years. But here again the age-discrimination is incidental and unimportant: the important qualifications for membership of the highest class are general ability and conspicuous patriotism.<sup>2</sup>

It would seem, therefore, that we must discard the theory that Plato's scheme of the 'Cardinal Virtues' and the corresponding social structure originates in an age-classification. As to the Cardinal Virtues, I think it impossible to doubt that Schleiermacher<sup>3</sup> is right in supposing these four to have been popularly recognised as constituent of complete *ἀρετή*: if it were not so Plato would not make Glaucon assent with a mere *δῆλον* to Socrates' equation of *τελέως ἀγαθή* with *σοφία + ἀνδρεία + σώφρων + δίκαια*.<sup>4</sup>

What, then, are we to suppose to have been the origin of Plato's parallel tripartitions of Soul and State?

It is a commonplace<sup>5</sup> that Plato was always impressed by the contrast of two types of character, the 'gentle' or 'reflective,' and the 'spirited' types, roughly represented by the Ionian or Athenian on the one hand, and the Dorian or Spartan on the other. He was accustomed to divide men roughly into three classes, distinguished according to temperamental tendency, (1) the reflective ('philosophic,' cultured), (2) the spirited (manly, warlike, athletic), (3) the slaves of appetite. Moreover, he saw that although the individual might be described by one of these terms (or sets of terms) because of the preponderance in him of the quality denoted, yet he repeated in himself the

<sup>1</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> 412c: *φρόνιμοι . . . καὶ δυνατοὶ καὶ θῆ- κηδεμόνες τῇ πόλει*.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Adam on 427x.

<sup>4</sup> 427x.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Adam's note on 375c, 19, where references are given.



three qualities. Consequently the great question, alike in ethics and politics, came to present itself thus: 'What is the proper balance between these three elements: what is the right *constitution*?' This is what is meant by the search for Justice.

Now, as regards the appetitive element in State and individual alike, Plato was never in doubt that it had simply to be repressed, kept in its place. There was no question of allowing it to realise itself, or of developing it into something better. But in regard to the other two elements, two methods of action would present themselves to his consideration—methods corresponding to two broad attitudes of mind. The first was the traditional method of Greek education: a man is not to cultivate his 'reflective' tendencies, his intellectual side, to the exclusion of all development of his other natural powers and tastes. It is the attitude that is not only typically Greek, but typically English. According to it the ideal character is a *blend* of 'culture' and 'manliness.' Throughout Plato's discussion of this method, that is, throughout the first scheme of Education, the word *φιλόσοφος* means what it meant to the Pericles of the Funeral Oration.<sup>1</sup> Plato may very likely, moreover, have conceived of his union of contraries as a sort of practical application of the fundamental thought of Heraclitus.

The other method is that of the thinker, the professed philosopher. According to it the claims of intellect are paramount, and 'manliness' must be put in its place, must be subjected to external authority, though of course it is not intrinsically bad, like 'appetite.' The important thing to this attitude of mind is not *character*, as to the former, but *knowledge*, though of course the attainment of knowledge is regarded as itself formative of character. The traditional Greek education is obviously unsuited to this view of life.

Now it is plain that the first of these two methods or attitudes is uppermost in *Rep.* ii.-iv., the second in vi.-vii. But where exactly is it that Plato passes from the one to the other, and why does he not indicate the transition explicitly? This is a question which has not, so far as I know, been raised precisely in this form, and it ought to be faced. To answer it we must attempt to reconstruct the plan of argument which Plato had in his mind at the outset of the dialogue. That plan was probably something very much simpler than is commonly supposed: in particular, he does not seem to have formed, before beginning to write, any parallelism between State and Soul based on a division of the latter according to psychological *faculties*. He had nothing more in his mind than that very general parallelism referred to above, based on temperamental tendencies; this is all that he means by founding his city *κατὰ φύσιν*. When he comes to formulate the elaborate parallel tripartitions of Book IV., we shall find that he confuses tendencies of character and faculties of soul: but of this we must speak presently.

The first step in the direction of a new mental attitude is taken with the

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. ii. 40: *φιλοσοφούμεν ἀνευ μαλακίας*.

introduction of the Rulers in iv. 412B. There is no hint of a separate class of Rulers when the Guardians are introduced in Book II., and it is difficult not to suppose, particularly from the language of 402-3, 412A, that the Education in Music and Gymnastic produces the highest possible type of individual: we are certainly led to expect that both the State, organised on the principle of 'appetitive' Artisans protected by Guardians, and the individual, correspondingly balanced, will be exemplars of *δικαιοσύνη*.

When the class of Rulers is first introduced, we do not get the impression that they are a separate class from the Auxiliaries in the same sense as the latter are a separate class from the Artisans. It is true that they are from the first held to possess *σοφία*: but their *σοφία* is no more than *εὐβουλία*, and is not based on any special intellectual equipment. It is only in Books VI.-VII. that we find the Rulers *toto caelo* differentiated from the Auxiliaries through their possession of *νόησις* as the result of dialectical training. Now I suggest that this complete differentiation was not in Plato's mind from the outset; that in writing the description of the Educational curriculum of Books II.-IV. he had not before his mind the Educational curriculum of Books VI.-VII.; in short, that he did not, when beginning to write the *Republic*, conceive of a State governed by a select class of trained metaphysicians.

Views similar to this have, of course, been put forward before now by separatist critics of the dialogue, notably by Krohn. I am not, however, prepared to go the whole way with the separatists, whose detailed arguments have mostly been met successfully by Adam. I believe that the dialogue may fairly be said to be a unity, there being no important points in which the educational scheme of VI.-VII is incompatible with that of II.-IV.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, I contend that this unity is the result of a somewhat external accommodation of two radically different lines of thought; and I wish to trace as far as may be the way in which the new line of thought superimposes itself upon the old, and the manner of their accommodation.

At 427D the State has been completely sketched. Being *ex hypothesi* perfectly virtuous, it contains the four Cardinal Virtues; and an obvious way of discovering in what these virtues consist is to assign them, so far as may be, to the different political classes. *σοφία* will clearly go to the deliberative element. But what of *ἀνδρεία*? Can that be assigned as the characteristic virtue of the *ἐπικούροι* fairly and consistently with all that we have heard of them up to this point? In the ordinary acceptance of the term it most certainly cannot; for in popular usage *ἀνδρείος* differed little, if at all, in meaning from *θυμοειδής*, and the educated Guardian is not merely *θυμοειδής*, but *φιλόσοφος* also. Interpreted, however, on Socratic principles it appears as *σωτηρία τῆς δόξης τῆς ὑπὸ νόμου διὰ τῆς παιδείας γεγονυίας περὶ τῶν δεινῶν, ἃ τέ ἐστι καὶ οἶα* (429C). And we are told that the whole object of the

<sup>1</sup> Contrast, however, 410C: *κινδυνεύουσιν ἀμφότερα* (i.e., Music and Gymnastic) *τῇ ψυχῇ ἐνεκα τοῦ μέγιστον καθίστασθαι* with 321B: *γυμναστική μὲν*

*πῶς περὶ γιγνόμενον καὶ ἀπολλόμενον τετελεσται, σώματος γὰρ ἀβέστη καὶ φθίσεως ἐπιστάται.*

educa  
δέξιν  
περὶ τ  
to us  
been  
entire  
will r  
squee  
have  
squee  
and l  
as a r  
T  
next  
tional  
expres  
dencie  
But in  
τινῶν  
these  
they a  
here g  
for th  
anoth  
'spiri  
nifica  
for th  
subje  
merel  
delibe  
of co  
harm  
A  
then  
Obvie  
ἐπικο  
find I  
only,  
amon  
tion o  
C  
latter

<sup>1</sup> 404  
τε καὶ δ

educational curriculum was ὅπως ἡμῖν ὁ τι κάλλιστα τοὺς νόμους πεισθέντες δέξονται ὥσπερ βαφὴν, ἵνα δευσποιοὺς αὐτῶν ἡ δόξα γίγνοιτο καὶ περὶ δεινῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων (430A). This is, or should be, a surprising piece of information to us: we should certainly not have supposed such a narrow object to have been in view from anything we were told in Books II-III; in fact, it is an entirely new idea in Plato's mind. The popularly recognised Cardinal Virtues will not accommodate themselves to Plato's political classes without some squeezing and pulling: for the φύλακες παντελεῖς and the φύλακες-ἐπίκουροι have a great deal in common, whereas σοφία and ἀνδρεία have not. Consequently they have to be pulled apart, with the result that the Rulers are less and less henceforward thought of as a *division* within a class, more and more as a new and highest class.

The differentiation which has thus set in has an important bearing on the next Virtue to be discussed, namely σωφροσύνη. Now throughout the educational discussions of II-IV σωφροσύνη<sup>1</sup> had been one of the terms used to express the condition arising from a blend of opposite temperamental tendencies: and so we are told (430E) that it ξυμφωνίᾳ τινὶ καὶ ἁρμονίᾳ προσείκειν. But in the next sentence another view is mentioned, which regards it as ἡδονῶν τινῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐγκράτεια. Now Plato is not at pains to point out that these two views are essentially opposed to each other, and in a certain sense they are both taken up and combined in his own conception of σωφροσύνη as here given. But it is important for our purpose to insist on their opposition, for the first view dispenses with the notion of *control* of one element by another, and implies that by a proper blending of the 'reflective' and 'spirited' elements the 'appetitive' element will *ipso facto* be rendered insignificant: there will be no war in the members for the truly μουσικός, no need for the rule of conscious Reason. But of the second view the essence is the subjection of one element to another: it implies that men are not σώφρονες merely as the result of a character formed by training and habit, but by the deliberate and conscious exercise of reason in moral choice. It is matter of common knowledge that both views are represented and more or less harmonised in Aristotle's theory of conduct.

According to the second view, σωφροσύνη in the Individual Soul means then the control of appetite by reason. What is the parallel in the State? Obviously the control of the lowest class by the Rulers. But what then of the ἐπίκουροι? It seems difficult to fit them into the scheme, and so in fact we find Plato here (431E, 433C) temporarily distinguishing between two classes only, οἱ ἀρχόντες and οἱ ἀρχόμενοι. The ἐπίκουροι must of course be included amongst the latter, a fact which in itself marks a fresh step in the differentiation of the two highest classes.

Of these two different views of σωφροσύνη Plato really decides<sup>2</sup> on the latter, in accordance with the growing prominence of the Rulers: but he

<sup>1</sup> 404E, 410A, 410E: τοῦ μὲν ἡρμωσμένου σώφρων τε καὶ ἀνδρεία ἡ ψυχὴ.

<sup>2</sup> He is helped by the common definition of σώφρων as κρείττων αὐτοῦ.

effects a sort of reconciliation between them under cover of the words *ὁμόνοια* or *ὁμοδοξία* (432A, 433C), representing the submission of ruled to rulers as voluntarily acquiesced in.

In the discussion of *σωφροσύνη* perhaps more clearly than anywhere else we can see the transition from the first of the general mental attitudes, distinguished above, to the second taking place; and at the end of that discussion Plato has definitely declared for the second attitude.

Justice is now (433E) defined as the strict observance of this constitution of sharply discriminated classes: it is not necessary for our purpose to dwell upon this. Plato's next task is to justify the political structure by showing it to be the counterpart of the structure of the individual soul.

It is now, I think, that Plato begins to realise his shift of attitude: for while representing Socrates as having no doubt of the existence of elements in the Soul corresponding to the three political classes, he makes him express hesitation in pronouncing that they exist as really separate faculties (436A-B). It is important to understand what exactly it is that Socrates feels doubtful about in the words *τάδε δὲ ἤδη χαλεπὸν, εἰ τῷ αὐτῷ τούτων ἕκαστα πράττομεν ἢ τρισὶν οὖσιν ἄλλο ἄλλῃ*. His meaning may, I think, be paraphrased thus: If we consider a particular action of a human being which involves moral choice, are we right in representing it as simply the expression of a *formed* character, a character which is such a complete blending of the three elements in question that the distinction between the three is lost, and the Soul appears as a unity which is *not* a unity of parts? or is this blending never, in actual fact, complete, so that in the action in question each element acts separately? In other words, does temperamental tendency provide us with an adequate psychological analysis? Were we right in assuming that a man's Soul was *static*, that we act because our characters are what they are, what they have been made by habit and training? Are they not rather never *formed*, but always *being* formed? Is the unity which we have supposed to be created by the blending of *τὸ φιλόσοφον* and *τὸ θυμοειδές*—a blending which carries with it the extinction of *τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν*—a fictitious unity, which falls apart at once?

The question, in fact, is between the old analysis according to temperamental tendencies, and the new analysis according to faculties of Soul, which latter is what Plato is trying to express by the word *εἶδη* which he uses in 440E. Opposing tendencies can be conceived of as capable of being blended into a new and single tendency, whereas by a faculty of Soul we imply something which is essentially and permanently different from any other faculty.

Now it is not merely the case that Plato was unable to find a philosophical terminology adequate to express this distinction; he did not clearly formulate the distinction in his mind. If he had done so he could not have given us that particular psychological tripartition which he does give us in 435-441. Mr. Cornford has pointed out<sup>1</sup> very truly that 'the scheme is

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 259.

artificial and false, and not such as a philosopher working independently by direct introspective analysis would be likely to reach.' He insists rightly on the difficulties involved in setting up τὸ θυμοειδές as a 'part' of Soul on the same footing as the other two 'parts,' and comes to the conclusion that 'the whole inquiry is suggested by the political analogy, and its results are pre-determined by the need of finding a part of the Soul which may act as a police-force to help reason in its rule, and can have ἀνδρεία for its characteristic virtue.'

With this conclusion I am in general agreement, but I do not think that it goes to the root of the matter. The tripartite Soul-structure as formulated in these pages is no doubt largely determined by the political analogy; but it will be clear from the whole argument of this paper that I differ from Mr. Cornford in that I believe Plato to have had a tripartite psychology in his mind from the beginning of Book II—a psychology, indeed, which is prior to the building up of the political structure. When the psychological scheme comes to be formulated, what we get is the original scheme accommodated to the new outlook, and so Plato is unconsciously involved in a *cross-classification* of temperamental tendencies and psychological faculties; hence the unnatural appearance of τὸ θυμοειδές as a 'part' of soul, with which Mr. Cornford is rightly dissatisfied. Nobody, I imagine, will be convinced by the arguments which Socrates adduces to prove that τὸ θυμοειδές is a psychological faculty, and I need only refer to Mr. Cornford's remarks upon them. The terms τὸ θυμοειδές and τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν are common to the original and the revised psychological scheme; but instead of τὸ φιλόσοφον we have now τὸ λογιστικόν. The necessity for this substitution will, I hope, be clear from my whole argument. Plato has in the case of the highest member of the tripartition avoided the error into which he fell as regards the second member; he has seen that it is impossible to twist that tendency of character which he had called τὸ φιλόσοφον into a faculty of soul. The lowest member can still be called τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, because the expression is capable of signifying both tendency and faculty.

As the tripartite psychology of 435-441 looks back to the educational scheme of Books II-IV, so it looks forward to that of Books VI-VII. The Rulers now correspond to τὸ λογιστικόν, the rational part of Soul, whose essence it is to rule the irrational, and so the Rulers are turned into metaphysicians. The scheme of VI-VII, is described<sup>1</sup> as a μακροτέρα περίοδος, which has to be taken in order adequately to establish the analysis of 'parts' of Soul. Needless difficulties have been made by commentators who have

<sup>1</sup> 504B. Here, as in 435D, the object of the μακροτέρα περίοδος is to distinguish the 'parts' of Soul. Adam is wrong in taking αὐτά in 504B 9 to refer to the Cardinal Virtues: according to a common Greek idiom the emphasis of the sentence beginning ἡγεμονεύουσιν μὲν πῶν in 504A falls on the participial clause, τριττὰ εἶδη ψυχῆς διαστη-

σάμενοι. When this is seen it will readily follow that αὐτά below refers to εἶδη. Moreover, in the participial clause itself the emphatic word is not τριττὰ, but εἶδη. Socrates' concern is not whether the 'parts' of soul are three in number or not but whether he is right in distinguishing 'parts' at all.

not understood in what way the discussion of these books contributes to the object proposed. Surely what Plato wants to do is to discern the ultimate meaning of the control of the irrational by the rational, which will show that he was justified in discarding the classification by 'tendencies' for that by 'parts' or 'faculties.' It is true that he shows us the meaning of the rule of Reason in the State only, leaving us to make the application to the individual for ourselves; but we can surely do this without difficulty. It is not the tripartite scheme, with its fallacious inclusion of τὸ θυμοειδές, that is established now, but the bipartite scheme of Rulers) (Ruled, τὸ λογιστικόν) (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, the scheme which, as I have shown, ought to have been laid down at IV 435-441, and would have been laid down had it not been for the relics of the older classification which had not then been completely discarded.

To sum up. I have attempted to trace the steps by which Plato was unconsciously led to a profound development of plan in writing the *Republic*. Starting with the conception of a parallelism between State and individual based on temperamental tendencies, he constructs a political system on the principle of a fusion of opposing elements, a system intended to exemplify Justice in the State; next he attempts to analyse the State thus constructed by applying to it the scheme of Cardinal Virtues, to which he forcibly accommodates it, though while doing so he radically modifies his original conception both of the State itself and of the individual Soul to whose constitution it was intended to conform; lastly the revised conception of Soul, then for the first time made explicit, leads to further modifications of the conception of the ideal State, notably to the introduction of philosophers as Rulers. The modification of plan is fortunate, for it gives us Books VI-VII.

R. HACKFORTH.

SIDNEY SUSSEX COLLEGE,  
CAMBRIDGE.

A  
there  
it pos  
elsew  
(= V  
12, 1,  
forwa  
also v  
both

S  
reduc  
Italia  
of son  
birth  
he w  
gives  
from  
estat  
ends  
F. O  
other  
their  
reaso  
Cicer  
Taln

1 D  
Berlin  
2 P  
3 u. '1  
3 C  
sqg.  
4 M  
5 C  
6 F  
Villa,  
7 A  
amari  
8 .

## NOTES ON TREBATIVS THE VELIAN.

AFTER the essays by Stange,<sup>1</sup> Hauckh,<sup>2</sup> and Boissier,<sup>3</sup> it would seem that there was little more to be said about Trebatius. Nevertheless, I have thought it possible to throw new light on some details of his life. I hope soon to prove elsewhere that his master in philosophy was Velleius; for the name *ueleius* (= *Velleius*) is, I think, hidden under *leius*, the abbreviation in *Ep. ad Fam.* vii. 12, 1, which has been hitherto misunderstood.<sup>4</sup> I should now like to bring forward a few points concerning the friendship of Trebatius with Cicero, and also with regard to his patrimony. The letter *Ad Fam.* vii. 20, is the basis of both these studies.

### I

Soon after the death of Caesar, Cicero, deceived in his hope of liberty and reduced to inaction,<sup>5</sup> has left Rome for Greece. He sails slowly along the Italian coast to Rhegium, landing every evening to stop the night in the house of some friend or client. On the 19th of July 44 B.C., he stops at Velia, the birthplace of Trebatius, who was then at Rome. The next day, before leaving,<sup>6</sup> he writes a letter to his friend. He congratulates him on his native town,<sup>7</sup> gives him news of his people.<sup>8</sup> He regrets that he is himself obliged to flee from Rome.<sup>9</sup> He gives him at the same time friendly advice not to sell his estate in Velia, even if he is to live chiefly in Rome henceforth.<sup>10</sup> The letter ends with a joke.<sup>11</sup> In whose house did Cicero stay in Velia? According to F. Orsini<sup>12</sup> and Hauckh (l. c.), the host is Trebatius; according to most of the other critics, ancient and modern, it is Talna. The first-named evidently base their hypothesis on the letter I have just quoted, but without giving any reasons. The others base theirs on the letter to Atticus xvi. 6, 1, in which Cicero clearly says that on this date, at this place, he stayed in the house of Talna. In spite of this testimony and against the opinion of the majority

<sup>1</sup> *De C. Trebatio Testa et eius loco inter aequales*, Berlin, 1849.

<sup>2</sup> Pauly's *Realencyclopädie der klass. Altert. Wiss.*, s.v. 'Trebatius.'

<sup>3</sup> *Cicéron et ses amis*, Paris, ed. 1910, pp. 244 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> M. zeius, GR. zeus.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Phil.* i. 6; *Top.* i. 5; *Ad Att.* xvi. 6, 2 sq.

<sup>6</sup> *Fam.* vii. 12, fin.; *Ventus increbrescit* . . .

*Velia*.

<sup>7</sup> *Amabilior mihi Velia fuit, quod te ab ea sensi*

*amari.*

<sup>8</sup> . . . *te ab ea (Velia) sensi amari* . . .; *Rufio*

*tuus ita desiderabatur, ut si esset unus e nobis; . . . nescio quid . . . Velienses verebantur* (about the final departure of Trebatius for Rome).

<sup>9</sup> . . . *Velia non est utilior quam Lupercal; tamen istuc (Lupercal) malo quam haec omnia (Velia and Trebatius' estate in Velia)*. Cf. also *Ad Att.* xvi. 6, 1 sq.; *Phil.* i. 8, 9.

<sup>10</sup> *Tu si me audies, quem soles, has paternas possessiones tenebis* . . .

<sup>11</sup> About Νίκαντος περί πολυφύλας.

<sup>12</sup> *Ciceronis Opp. ex Dion. Lămbini* . . . *emendat*. . . cum notis F. Ursini, ap. A. Gryph. Lyon, 2 iii. p. 520; note on *Att.* xvi. 6, 1.



of critics, I think that we have to deal with the house of Trebatius. My reasons are the following:

Firstly, if in this journey Cicero asks the hospitality of friends and acquaintances, like Sicca,<sup>1</sup> P. Valerius,<sup>2</sup> is it probable that he should have stayed at Velia elsewhere than at the house of his intimate friend Trebatius? The letter which he writes on his departure—compliments, news and advice about the estate—looks very much like a letter of thanks. Secondly, no sooner is he on board again, than he sets to work writing *Topics*<sup>3</sup> to please Trebatius<sup>4</sup>; he is discharging a 'debt'<sup>5</sup>; 'he has just remembered it on seeing the people and the estate of his friend.'<sup>6</sup> The sudden remembrance of the debt and the eagerness to discharge it is only natural, if it is indeed the house of Trebatius in which he has received hospitality. Thirdly, we know for certain that he has been exceedingly well treated at Velia in the house of an absent friend.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, in the MSS. (*Ad Att.* l. c.) this friend is named Talna: now I contend, firstly, that Talna could scarcely be the host of Cicero; secondly, that being so, I say that Talna can be read as Testa, the nickname of Trebatius.

1. Who is this Talna? It cannot be the one mentioned in the Clodius case, whom Cicero counts among the *iudices corruptissimi* (*Att.* i. 6, 6). Could it be the Talna who was a supposed suitor of Attica, the daughter of Atticus? As such he could very well be the host of his future father-in-law's best friend. But in point of fact, he was never the husband<sup>8</sup> or even the suitor of Attica.<sup>9</sup> In the passages of Cicero's correspondence, where this supposed marriage-treaty is mentioned, it most likely refers to one between Talna and a more or less distant relation of Atticus<sup>10</sup>; this makes the acquaintance with Cicero much slighter; all the more as nowhere is the marriage mentioned as having actually taken place.<sup>11</sup> Did Cicero know this Talna at all? We are told that he speaks of him twice (*Att.* xiii. 29; 21), besides *Att.* xvi. 6. He certainly speaks of him xiii. 29; but here we see that he knows him very slightly; indeed, after making enquiries regarding him, he has been told not only about his fortune, but even about his personality. As to the letter xiii. 21, it is

<sup>1</sup> *Att.* xvi. 6, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Att.* ib. 7, 1; cf. *Phil.* i. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Fam.* vii. 19: *Ut primum Velia navigare coepi, institui Topica . . . conscribere, ab ipsa urbe communitus amantissima tui.* Cf. *Top.* i. 5: *haec . . . in ipsa navigatione conscripsi.*

<sup>4</sup> *Top.* init., *Fam.* vii. 19, init.

<sup>5</sup> *Fam.* vii. 19: *Id absenti debere non potui; cf. Top.* i. 5: *non potui igitur tibi . . . debere diutius; ut veni Veliam . . . admonitus huius artis alimi . . . nolui desse ne tacitae quidem flagitationi tuae.*

<sup>6</sup> *Fam.* vii. 19, see n. 7; *Top.* i. 5: *Vt veni Veliam tuaque et tuos vidi, admonitus, etc. . . . In sending the Topics, he begins by remarking that he receives from Trebatius as great marks of friendship as he gives himself: vide quanti apud me sis; etsi tunc id quidem; non enim te amore visco.*

<sup>7</sup> *Att.* xvi. 6, 1: *Cum unum diem Veliae constitissem, ubi quidem fui sane libenter apud Talnam nostrum nec potui accipi, illo absente praesertim liberalius.*

<sup>8</sup> *Corn. Nep.* *Att.* 19, 4: *Agrippa, cui (Atticus) virginem filiam collocarat.*

<sup>9</sup> *Drumann, Gesch. Roms.* v. p. 92 and n. 2. Cf. *Lettres de Cicéron à Att.* avec remarques, par L. Mongault, Paris, 1714, t. 5, pp. 524, 570: *Attica was much too young and the suitor not rich enough.*

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Mongault, op. cit. p. 524, and *Drumann* l. c.

<sup>11</sup> The only time that this marriage-treaty is clearly mentioned (*xiii.* 29, 1), the friend and confidant of Atticus, Cicero, seems to consider Talna's means insufficient.

written earlier; therefore he cannot know him any better then. Moreover, Cicero, if it is of him he speaks, says, *Ipsum non novi*; but I do not think that he speaks of him at all nor of his family, for he says: 'What I know (of the candidate), that is . . . his family and his means, is satisfactory.'<sup>1</sup> In the letter xiii. 29, he says that Talna's means are small and unsatisfactory.<sup>2</sup> It cannot be the same man; therefore when Cicero writes, xiii. 21, 7, *patrem amo, idque et merito et iam diu*, it is evidently not Talna's father of whom he is thinking. I conclude that from internal evidence afforded by two of the letters, Cicero can hardly have been the guest at Velia of either Talna or Talna's family.

2. Remains the letter xvi. 6, 1: . . . *apud Talnam nostrum*. If I have proved that Cicero did not know Talna as a friend or even as an acquaintance, and on the other hand, that there is every reason for believing him to have been the guest of Trebatius—since there are no texts or inscriptions of any kind to prove that Talna had any connection with Velia at all—cannot *Talnam* be read as *Testam*, the nickname of Trebatius?

Petrarch seems to have corrected Cicero's correspondence more than once.<sup>3</sup> Our sources for this passage<sup>4</sup> perhaps are all derivations more or less direct from his volume (Veronensis). Let us suppose that he read *Testam* in it; this name had no sense for him, since it is not mentioned or explained elsewhere than in the correspondence *Ad Familiares*, which we know Petrarch never saw. The words *apud Testam nostrum* would necessarily lead him to look for the name of a friend common to Cicero and Atticus beginning with T and ending with A, and having the same number of letters. He had already met with the cognomen Talna several times in the correspondence *Ad Att.*,<sup>5</sup> and in his much-read<sup>6</sup> volume of Titus Livius.<sup>7</sup> Thus he could write in the margin of the Veronensis, *al. alnam*. In fact, M, which seems to be a direct copy of this manuscript, gives *Talanam*. Or, without making any correction, he may have put down in the margin, as he was in the habit of doing, the name which had struck him; now in his time these syllables were sometimes abbreviated as *testam(entum)*,<sup>8</sup> *Tslam*; and therefore a copyist could mechanically read *t=tal*, *Nam=nam*.

Finally, the conjecture that Cicero did really stay in the house of Trebatius at Velia is confirmed by the fact that, in the letter written to him on his

<sup>1</sup> Att. xiii. 21, 7: *Quod autem de illa nostra cogitatione scribis, . . . ea quae novi, valde probō, nomen, domum, facultates.*

<sup>2</sup> Att. xiii. 29, 1: *Incidimus in Talnam* (we came to speak of T.): *hoc mihi non placuit: se scire aiebat* (Nicias) *ab eo nuper p̄tillam Cornificiam, Q. filiam, utulam sane et multarum nuptiarum; non esse probatum mulieribus, quod ita reperirent, rem non maiorem DCCC: hoc p̄tanti te scire oportere.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lehmann, *de Cic. ad Att. ep.*, Berlin, 1892, pp. 168 n. 1, and 169; cf. also de Nohac, *Petrarche et l'humanisme*, i. p. 256, 257 et n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Talanam* M and ed. Jensen; *Talnam* ed. Rom.

<sup>5</sup> Att. i. 16, 6; xiii. 29, 1.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. de Nohac, *op. cit.* ii. p. 14 sq.

<sup>7</sup> The name of Talna is in T. L. xxxix. 31; xlv. 21 etc. It is not perhaps the only time that this cognomen has been substituted for words of difficult understanding in this correspondence; for in P. Manut. (*comment. in ep. Cic. ad Att.*, Venice, 1572, p. 753), and in Lamb. (*Cic. opp. Lyon t. iii, Att. xv. 26, 4*), (*servituti*) *apud tale* (*quid*) is given without explanatory notes *apud Talnas*.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. A. Cappelli, *Dizionario di abbreviati lat. ed ital.*, Milano, 1912, p. 381, col. 2, l. 2.

departure from Velia (*Fam.* vii. 20), he advises Trebatius to keep the Velian estate even for friendship's sake, *id mea interesse . . . arbitror*, and that the same letter contains some fresh impressions about the estate, *Papirianam domum, . . . tuos . . . agros, . . . remoto, salubri, amoeno loco; . . . nobilem amnem Haletem* (perhaps the house was close to the river), which he would scarcely have mentioned, had he not stayed on that very estate. We shall also see that the letter contains still more characteristic details which will put an end to every doubt.

## II

While Cicero is trying to persuade Trebatius not to part with his Velian estate, he writes these words (*Fam.* vii. 20, 1 fin.): *has paternas possessiones tenebis . . . nec Papirianam domum deseres; quamquam illa quidem habet lotum, a quo etiam aduenae teneri solent; quem tamen si excideris, multum prospexeris.*

Where is this lotus? Does it belong to the house at Rome, or to the Velian estate?

1. To begin with, is one to read *lotum* or *lucum*? The recent editions give *lotum*, but without giving the proper reasons.

As a fact, this reading (M) has been put aside by some since the Renaissance, because *lotus* is generally feminine.<sup>1</sup> The only example of *lotus* in the masculine, given by Purser and Tyrrell,<sup>2</sup> hardly justifies in Cicero such a licence with the rules of the names of trees: *lotum, a quo . . . quem . . .*; and the upholders of the reading *lotum* have felt themselves this strong grammatical difficulty.<sup>3</sup> The reading *lucum*, which other MSS.<sup>4</sup> seem to authorize, might be more satisfactory. If we are on the Lupercal,<sup>5</sup> the spot where the legendary she-wolf disappeared in the woods, this allusion is witty, however small be the *lucus*. If we are in the country, the sacred wood is quite in its place; the friend of Trebatius, Horace,<sup>6</sup> will also possess a *luculus* at Tibur.<sup>7</sup> Finally, be it at Rome or at Velia, this sacred wood will be of particular interest to Trebatius, who, we know, has written about these very *luci*.<sup>8</sup> If it is said that Cicero could scarcely advise anybody to cut down sacred woods,<sup>9</sup> and especially Trebatius, a man so particular about 'purchasing and keeping' such woods,<sup>10</sup> one can answer as did Paulus Manutius: *nos existimamus . . . non Ciceronem impie consuluisset, qui eum (lucum) a Trebatio caedi uellet; quomodo*

<sup>1</sup> Plin. *H.N.* xiii. (32) 17, 104; xvi. (85) 44, 235; xvii. 1, 5; xxii. (27) 21, 55; xxiv. 2, 6 etc.

<sup>2</sup> Mart. *Epigr.* viii. 51, 15: *Palladius tenero lotos ab ore sonat.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Tyrrell and Purser, *Corresp.* of Cic. v. p. 342 sq.; P. Victorii, *Explic. suar. in Cic. castig.* ap. S. Gryph. Lyon, 1552, p. 71: *Aduersatur solum antiquae lectioni (= lotum) quod lotum foemino genere alii auctores appellarunt, cum ipse masculino usurpet: quare accurate considerandum est, utrumne ea parte ictus (M) habeat, sine eo genere contra plurimorum morem, quod uix uerisimile est, Cic. appellare lotum uoluerit.*

<sup>4</sup> *lucum* GR.

<sup>5</sup> . . . *te ego non reprehendo, qui illum* (Rufionem

tuum) ad aedificationem tuam traduxeris; quamquam enim Velia non est uilius quam Lupercal, tamen istuc malo . . .

<sup>6</sup> Sat. ii. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Suet. *Hor.*: *Domusque eius ostenditur circa Tiburtini luculum*; Hor. C. i. 17, 13.

<sup>8</sup> *Iurispr. anteiustin. relig.*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 44, n. 6 (de relig.). I do not think that the upholders of *lucum* have ever noticed this fact, which would confirm their thesis.

<sup>9</sup> *Pro Mti.* 85, . . . *tumuli . . . luci . . . aras, quas ille praiceps amentia caesis prostratisque sanctissimis lucis substructionum insanis molibus oppresserat.*

<sup>10</sup> See note 8.

*enim recte et sine piaculo id fieri posset, docuit M. Cato in l. de r.r. (viz. cap. 139).*<sup>1</sup> If it is objected that Cicero recommends his friend to cut these trees to the root (*excidere*)—and not only *conlucare*, as it is in the Catonian rule—and that this would be sacrilegious, I answer that in fact the word *conlucare* seems to mean not only to lop the trees, but to do away with them;<sup>2</sup> therefore *excidere* is not necessarily sacrilegious.

Nevertheless the upholders of *lotum* are right, although they do not justify their opinion sufficiently. Firstly, the reading *lotum* is given here by M, the best of the MSS.; besides *lotum* explains easily the false reading *lutum* (GR), while *lucum* leads easily to *lutum*, but not to *lotum*. Secondly, the reading *lotum* is justifiable in itself.

Indeed a *quo aduenae teneri solent* is suggestive. It is evident that the writer alludes to the fruit of the lotos, on account of which the companions of Ulysses could no longer tear themselves away from the African coast.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, this allusion to the *λωτός* of Homer is made in about the same words as in Pliny,<sup>4</sup> or in Silius Italicus.<sup>5</sup> Therefore Cicero means that tree, the fruit of which was *μελιγδύς*, and not a tree which was simply agreeable to the sight, as it has been said.<sup>6</sup>

The gender of lotus is explained by the Greek reminiscence. This word, as it is usually written (*lotos*),<sup>7</sup> has kept in Latin the Greek form, whatever be the plant which is alluded to in the various cases. In Greek it is masculine, and it is sometimes of the same gender in Latin when the writer follows with docility the thought of a Greek; for instance, where Pliny translates Theophrastus.<sup>8</sup> I believe this case in Cicero to spring from the same reasons.

As to the construction *a quo*, we are not surprised by it, as this marvellous fruit is naturally personified like *Voluptas*<sup>9</sup> and other attractive things. We are not surprised either at this poetical allusion, which was probably to the taste of Trebatius, since such passages are often found in the letters written to him by Cicero.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, the double meaning of the witticism *multum*

<sup>1</sup> Ep. ad. Fam. lib. xvi., cum Hubert. Cler. Crescent. . . P. Manut. comment., Venice, ap. Bonellum, 1568, i. 130.

<sup>2</sup> Fest. de verb. signific. sub uerbis *conlucare*, *sublucare*; Pl. N.H. xvii. (47) 28 fin.

<sup>3</sup> Hom. Od. ix. 93 sqq.: οἱ Λωτοφάγοι σφι ὄδον Λωτοίο πείσασθαι. | τῶν δ' ὄντι Λωτοίο φάγον μελιγδέα καρπὸν, | οὐκ ἐν' ἀπαγγελίαι πάλις ἔβηεν, οὐδὲ νέεσθαι. | ἄλλ' ἀποῦ βοῶλοντο μετ' ἀνδράσι Λωτοφάγοιςιν | Λωτὸν ἔρποντο μινεμεν, νόστον δὲ λαθέσθαι. | τοῖσι μὲν ἔγνων ἐπὶ ἥρας ἄγον κλαίοντας ἀνάγκη, | νηυσὶ δ' ἐπὶ γλαφυρῶσιν ὄνδ' ἱγυῖα δῖσα ἱέσασαι.

<sup>4</sup> Plin. N.H. xiii. 17 (32) 105: (. . . dulci . . . cibo, ut nomen etiam genis dederit) nimis hospitali aduenarum obliuione patrias.

<sup>5</sup> Sil. It. iii. 310 (Lotophagi) Ἰγνος . . . dulci fuscit lotos nimis hospita bacca. Cf. Tib. i. iv. 55: Nec ualuit lotos coepitos auertere cunius (Ulyxis).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. P. Manutius (Ep. ad Fam. . . Venice, 1568, fo 130<sup>r</sup>) and his followers of same and later centuries.

<sup>7</sup> Pl. xiii. (32) 17, 104; xvi. (78) 40, 212; (85) 44, 235; xxii. (27) 21, 55; xxiv. 2, 6. Col. vii. 9, 6; Ov. Met. x. 96 etc.

<sup>8</sup> Pl. xiii. (32) 17, 105: (*lotos*) *densus in ramis*; Theophr. H. Pl. iv. 3, 1: *πικρὸς ἐπὶ τῶν φαστῶν*. Pl. ibid.: *ferunt uentris non sentire morbos qui eum mandunt*; Theophr. l. l.: *ἐσθιόμενος δὲ . . . ἡδὺς καὶ ἀσυνῆς καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς τὴν κοιλίαν ἀγαθός*. Pl. ib. 106: *exercitus pastos eo accepimus*; Theophr. ib. 2: (*τὸν ὄνδ' Ὀφείλλον στραπὸνδεον . . .*) *καὶ τούτω φαεὶ . . . κεχρησθαι*. Cf. Hyg. fab. 125 (in the part translated from Greek sources) *lotos* used in the masculine. Cf. Martial, viii. 51, 34: *Palladius . . . lotos*.

<sup>9</sup> Sen. De vit. beat. xi. 1 (*sapiens*) *ab hac (Voluptate) occupatus*. Cf. Quint. Inst. Or. v. 8: . . . *hi, qui traduntur a poetis gustu cuiusdam apud Lotophagos graminis (sic) delentis Voluptatem saluti praetulisse*.

<sup>10</sup> Fam. vii. 6, 10; 13, 16.

*prospexeris* is clear.<sup>1</sup> Firstly, the bushy tree which grew in the land of the Lotophagi (*zizyphus* or *rhamnus lotus*, Desfontaines)<sup>2</sup> can reach both in width and even in height such proportions as to hide the view completely from the inhabitants of a law house;<sup>3</sup> therefore it had to be cut down sometimes (*excideris*). Secondly, if it is cut down, the attractive fruit having disappeared, greedy guests will leave also (*multum prospexeris = tibi consulueris*—Victorius): the latter sense is of course only a joke brought to Cicero's mind by the Homeric recollection. The former meaning was clear with the reading *lucum*, but the latter was not.

2. Now we can guess the place where the house in question stood, for the lotos grows on the coasts.<sup>4</sup> Velia is, in fact, at the seaside; we are at the end of July; the fruit was then ripening.<sup>5</sup> Cicero speaks of it because he has seen and perhaps tasted it. He who is on the point of sailing from *amabilis Velia* is, —at least, poetically speaking—among the *aduenae* held back by the marvellous lotos of his host! We understand the parenthesis *quem si excideris, multum prospexeris*, for the view is wide and beautiful from the coast. Behind Cicero, is the semicircle of hills, with the river and a little plain; before him, the two islets, Pontia and Ischia, with their *ὑφορμοί*, the promontory Palinuri and the Tyrrhenian sea, with a yellow streak at the mouth of the river.<sup>6</sup> *Multum prospexeris* applies properly to so wide a landscape.<sup>7</sup> The house of Trebatius, already inhabited by several generations,<sup>8</sup> was probably one-storied like the houses of Pompeii dating from before the first century B.C.; therefore the view from it could very well be hidden by the bushy trees.

This opinion is contrary to the traditional version, according to which the house with lotos was situated in Rome at the Lupercal.<sup>9</sup> The arguments of the critics seem at first sight plausible. It is implied that by the word *quamquam* Cicero weighs the reasons that Trebatius might have for residing permanently in Rome, and those for not abandoning the house of his ancestors; thus by *illa quidem* he is therefore referring to the Roman house, and by 'has possessiones' to the Velian estate.

To begin with, if the author marks any antithesis with *has possessiones* (where I am), we wonder why he has put down *illa* and not *ista* (where you

<sup>1</sup> Already pointed out by Hub. Cler. et P. Manut. (op. cit. f° 129<sup>r</sup> and 130<sup>r</sup>), by Victorius l.c.

<sup>2</sup> *Mém. de l'Acad. des Sc.* 1788: *Recherches sur un arbrisseau connu sous le nom de Lotos de Lybie*.

<sup>3</sup> Mgr. Lévêillé, the well-known 'Secrétaire perpétuel de l'Acad. Intern. de Géogr. Bot.' has kindly confirmed this property of the *rhamnus lotus*.

<sup>4</sup> Detail equally confirmed by Mgr. Lévêillé. Cf. Hdt. iv. 177; Strab. c. 834; Pol. i. 39; Pl. N. H. v. 4, 28; 7, 41; xiii. (32) 17, 104; Sil. It. iii. 310 etc. Cf. Roscher, *Lexih. der Griech. u. Rom. Mythol.*, s.u. *Lotophagen*.

<sup>5</sup> Equally confirmed by Mgr. Lévêillé.

<sup>6</sup> On the whole landscape, cf. Lenormant: *A travers l'Apulie et la Lucanie*, il. pp. 363, 365, 378; Baedeker, *Ital. merid.* 1907, p. 261; on Velia and Palinuri promontorium, Vell. Pat. ii. 79; Val. Max. ii. 79, 3; on the islets, Strab. c. 252 fin.; Pl. N. H. iii. (13) 7, 85.

<sup>7</sup> Pl. Iun. v. 6, 19: *Xystum . . . et protinus pratum multumque ruris uidet (tricinium); fenestris hac latus xysti, hac nemus . . . comasque prospectat*; cf. ibid. 13 *magnam capies uoluptatem, si hunc regionis situm ex monte prospexeris*. Cf. Cic. *Ac. pr.* II. 80; 105.

<sup>8</sup> *Has paternas possessiones . . . Papirianam domum*.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Tyrrell and Purser, vi. p. 342.

are), as he has already done (*istuc malo quam haec omnia*). Moreover, the true train of thoughts on this point has not been understood by the critics. Cicero wonders with the Velians whether Trebatius will make up his mind to leave this estate, *nobilem amnem, Papirianam domum*; he advises him not to do so. 'Besides, say he, this house possesses the lotus, from which even the strangers cannot tear themselves away.' Trebatius, who is a native, will have all the more difficulty to do so! Nothing can be clearer. But why *illa*? *Illā* strengthens *quidem*,<sup>1</sup> and that is all. As such, it adds importance to the lotus in this letter of advice.

Cicero gives the following reasons for not leaving.<sup>2</sup> The estate will remain a place of refuge among good friends in these troubled political times. The site is picturesque and the air is good. At the same time there are many memories sacred to Trebatius attached to the place, which make Velia of no less value than the Lupercal.<sup>3</sup>

On the one hand, the Lupercal is the religious and political centre of Rome. The grotto was the starting-point of the Lupercalia processions—this ceremony so venerable to all the lovers of old customs.<sup>4</sup> The legends of the she-wolf and the twins, of Evander, of Mars the lover of Rhea Silvia, were also attached to the spot. What a 'halo' this place must have had in the eyes of the author of *De Religionibus*! Possibly the thought of living there will have been in his mind a compensation to that of leaving his birthplace for ever. On the other hand, how priceless are the memories attached to the birthplace, memories of his own father and family,<sup>5</sup> memories of the history of Velia. Cicero is a scholar to whom Trebatius' Velia, like his own Formiae,<sup>6</sup> brings back reminiscences of ancient history. The words *nobilis Haletes* have no other meaning than this: for we know how very intimately the history of river and town were associated<sup>7</sup> with each other; the facts are well known and belong to both; how the Phocians,<sup>8</sup> and perhaps the Ionians,<sup>9</sup> settled on that spot; how there grew up institutions, trade,<sup>10</sup> art,<sup>11</sup> a school of philosophy;<sup>12</sup> how the city for centuries preserved its independence in despite of Roman and Lucanian; how it nursed in convalescence Rome's great men (such as Paulus Aemilius), and how it furnished the mother city

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *de Off.* iii. 9, 39; *Fam.* vi. 2, 2; xii. 9, 1; *de Fin.* v. 23, 68; *ad Brut.* ii. 15, 9; in *Catili.* ii. 10; *pro Marc.* 9, etc. Cf. *Sen. de Vit. Beat.* xix. 2.

<sup>2</sup> § 2 *Sed in primis opportunum videtur, his praesertim temporibus, habere perfrugium, primum eorum urbem quibus carus sis, deinde tuam domum tuosque agros, eaque remoto, salubri, ameno loco.*

<sup>3</sup> . . . Velia non est utilior quam Lupercal. . . . tu si me audis quem soles, has paternas possessiones tenebis . . . nobilem amnem Haletem, etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Ad Q. fr.* ii. 11 [13], 4; *pro Coelio*, 26.

<sup>5</sup> . . . has paternas possessiones.

<sup>6</sup> *Att.* 13, 2: Si vero in hanc Τηλέυλον νεμερίσ Λαυτερύοντες, Formias dico. . . .

<sup>7</sup> Strab. c. 252 (some derive the name of the city from that of the river).

<sup>8</sup> *Hdt.* i. 164, 7; Strab. c. 252; Hyg. ap. A. Gell. x. 16.

<sup>9</sup> Giac. Racioppi: *Stor. del pop. della Lucania e della Basilicata*, Roma, Loescher, 1902, 2nd ed. vol. i. p. 178.

<sup>10</sup> Strab. *ibid.*, Racioppi, op. cit., p. 211.

<sup>11</sup> Coins: cf. Lenormant, *Gr. Grèce* ii. 315; Id. *La monnaie dans l'antiquité*, vol. iii. p. 259. Pottery; Id., *A travers . . . la Lucanie*, ii. p. 405; de Witte, *Description d'une coll. de vases peints*, p. 56. Cf. Racioppi, op. cit., p. 184 sq.

<sup>12</sup> Parmenides, Zeno (cf. Strab. c. 252; Diog. Laert. ix., cap. 3; 5; etc.): the latter had died for the liberty of his country (Cicero, *Tusc.* ii. 52; *De Nat. Deor.*, iii. 82).



with priestesses of Ceres.<sup>1</sup> But the history of the river was still more ancient; at its mouth were the two rocky islets, 'Oenotrides,' the name of which was a remembrance of the oldest inhabitants of Southern Italy;<sup>2</sup> as in these days, Trebatius and Cicero could see there remains of Pelasgian monuments.<sup>3</sup> And perhaps 'the Papirian house' was in some way *nobilis* like the river. These words mean that the house before being inhabited by the father of Trebatius had belonged to one of the *gens Papiria*, and out of this *gens* sprang the conqueror of Lucania (272 B.C.), as well as the consul under whom the Lucanians broke the treaty with Rome (326). After these allusions to the past, the one to the lotus, the *nobilis arbor*,<sup>4</sup> gives yet more price to the noble dwelling, which, in fact, as it seems, was a poor one!<sup>5</sup> And the scholarly Velian Trebatius could think as well of the legendary Λωτοφάγοι both of the African coast and of the near Sicily<sup>6</sup> as of his humble countrymen!

An objection can be raised.

This passage, interpreted as a witty recollection from Homer, has led us to place the lotos at Velia. But, like Pliny,<sup>7</sup> might not Cicero mistake the Homeric λωτός with the nettle-tree (*Celtis australis*)? And that would possibly bring us to Rome.<sup>8</sup> For we know through Pliny that the latter grew on the Palatine,<sup>9</sup> at the Volcanal,<sup>10</sup> and on the Esquiline.<sup>11</sup>

My answer is: Firstly, that Cicero was a great reader and admirer of Polybius,<sup>12</sup> who describes<sup>13</sup> the λωτός as a fruit seen and perhaps eaten of by himself; there is, therefore, no reason to suppose that he should have made a mistake, like the philosopher Theophrastus,<sup>14</sup> the model of Pliny in this passage. Thus he could not think that the delicious lotos *a quo aduenae teneri solent*—the African *seedra*, which is still nowadays appreciated by men—was the same thing as the berries of the nettle-tree, which are left to school-children! Secondly, nothing proves that there were nettle-trees close to the Palatine, other than those mentioned by Pliny there; and he spoke (l. l.) of the trees grown and of the shoots sprung up from their roots, all through Roman history, in famous places;<sup>15</sup> any such trees or shoots in the well-known Lupercal would have

<sup>1</sup> Racioppi, op. cit., p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Pl. N.H. iii. (13) 7, 85; Strab., ibid.; Hdt. i. 167.

<sup>3</sup> Racioppi, op. cit., p. 171 sqq., 178; p. 64. Cf. Lenormant, *A travers . . . la Lucanie*, ii. p. 383. Perhaps the name Hales brought also back to his memory, by the means of some legend, the river of the same name, in the island of Cos (Theocr. Id., vii. ed. Ahrens, p. 27, 1st verse).

<sup>4</sup> Silius It. iii. 310.

<sup>5</sup> For Trebatius' family was not wealthy; cf. Stange, op. cit., p. 9 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Schol. Od. 10, 1; Eustath., p. 1644, 40; v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Hom. Untersuchungen*, p. 169.

<sup>7</sup> Plin. xiii. (32) 17 inlt.

<sup>8</sup> Such seems to be the opinion of many ancient and modern critics; cf. Victorius, Explic. . . . p. 71: (*incunda* (lotosum) *opacitas erat* . . . ;

. . . *loti deliciarum causa summa arte colebantur* . . . ;

. . . *aduenas autem raram arborem uisabant* . . . ) etc. Cf. Tyrrell and Purser: 'On the splendour of

the lotus and the high value set by the Romans on having it in the private estates,' see Pl. N.H. xvii. proem. (*Loti, fatula ramorum opacitate lasciuas*, etc.). There as well as xiii. (32) 17, Pliny seems to be thinking of the *Celtis australis*.

<sup>9</sup> xvii. proem.

<sup>10</sup> xvi. (86) 44, 236.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. (85) 44, 235.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *De Off.* iii. 113; *Att.* xiii. 30, 3; *Fam.* v.

12, 2; *De Rep.* passim.

<sup>13</sup> Pol. ap. Athen. Deipn. xiv. 65.

<sup>14</sup> Fraas: *Synopsis Plantarum Florae classicae*, München, 1845, p. 94.

<sup>15</sup> xvi. (86) 44, 236: *Radices eius* (of the one of the Volcanal) *in forum usque Caesaris*, etc.



attracted his attention. Thirdly, if we suppose that there had been some, could Cicero write these words, *quem . . . si excideris, multum prospexeris*?

(a) It needs long reflection before deciding to cut down such a tall and fine tree as the *bagolaro*,<sup>1</sup> even should it hide the view in some way; Crassus, it will be remembered, prized the *bagolari* of his dwelling on the Palatine very highly.<sup>2</sup> Should they have been really a great annoyance to the view, surely it would have been enough to lop the branches of such tall trees,<sup>3</sup> without cutting to the root. (b) Supposing even that they could hide the view in any way, the house being still in the process of building, Trebatius would have taken this into account, and there was no need to give him such advice. (c) From the Lupercal, as it is located by the latest and surest topography,<sup>4</sup> there is no wide view to speak of; for the Palatine, the Janiculum, the Aventine, and the Capitolium shut off the horizon almost completely.

Therefore, in *Ad Fam.* vii. 20, it is the Velian estate that Cicero describes in the passage where he speaks of the lotus. We have the right to conclude that it was on this Velian estate that Cicero stayed in July 44.

F. PRÉCHAC.

BEAUVAIS.

<sup>1</sup> Italian name of the nettle-tree.

<sup>2</sup> Pl. *N.H.* xvii. prooem. This dwelling is now in the hands of Cicero, who highly appreciates and cares for all the *doles* of it. Cf. A. Lichtenberger, *de Cic. re priv.*, Paris, 1895 (pp. 3, 7, 8, 9). I do not think that this historical ornament of Cicero's house has ever been mentioned hitherto. Does this silence of modern critics mean that the

trees were destroyed by the Clodius fire? But if so, how should Pliny have seen them and spoken of their old age?

<sup>3</sup> As they do in Southern France, at Aix or Nîmes.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Richter, *Topogr. der Stadt Rom*, pp. 35 and 133 (in *Handbuch*, by Ivan Müller).

# LVCRETIUS IV. 1223—1228.

INDE Venus uaria producit sorte figuras  
maiorumque refert uoltus uocesque comasque,  
1225 quandoquidem nilo magis haec de semine certo  
fiunt quam facies et corpora membraque nobis.  
1227 et muliebres oritur patrio de semine saeculum  
maternoque mares existunt corpore creti. . .

Munro, followed by Giussani, transposes 1227, 8 to precede 1225. Lambinus reads *minus* for *magis*. I cannot but think that the whole passage is correct as it stands; the key to it is to be found in Aristotle, *Gen. An.* I. xviii. 722<sup>a</sup> 5, καὶ φωνὴν καὶ δυνχας καὶ τρίχας ὅμοιοι γίγνονται καὶ τὴν κίνησιν, 'children are like their parents in voice, hair, etc.,' not only in flesh, face, limbs, and so on. His argument is directed to a different end from that of Lucretius, and anyone who will look at his context will see why he mentions *δυνχας καὶ τρίχας* as well as *φωνὴν καὶ κίνησιν*. But it was from this passage that the contrast between *uoltus uocesque comasque* and *facies et corpora membraque* ultimately derives, perhaps through Epicurus. Only it has been misapplied, so that there is no longer much point about it, and the mention of *comas* has no justification at all. Then Aristotle goes on directly to speak of resemblance to remoter ancestors; hence comes our *maiorum*; the two points are quite distinct in Aristotle, but in Lucretius they have been amalgamated.

The meaning is this: 'Hence Venus produces all sorts of combinations of resemblances, not only to parents, but even to ancestors, not only in face and limb, but even in expression of countenance and tone of voice (*hair* ought by rights to have been left out). For these things also are not produced by any single fixed principle of generation any more than face and limbs are,' and therefore we get all sorts of combinations of resemblance in them too.

Munro naturally asks 'what reason could there be for the poet's asserting that they (*uoltus*, etc.) are as uncertain in their origin as the body generally?' Is not the passage in Aristotle the answer to this question? It is likely enough that either Epicurus or Lucretius himself may have fallen into confusion about it.

Lachmann and Munro and Giussani all say that *semine certo* is opposed to *duplici semine* in 1229. It is with great trepidation that I differ, but honestly I think that it is rather opposed to *multa modis primordia multis* in 1220.

With Munro's transposition, *haec* in 1225 is also decidedly harsh.

ARTHUR PLATT.

Cont  
Cicer  
Come  
G. V  
of th  
Gebi  
Simo  
Pohl  
editio  
once

the  
in th  
of th  
Culin  
place  
the  
Cess  
satir  
on th  
of C  
them  
P. L  
is in  
Lucr  
in th

C. P  
revie  
présen

was  
e Cl  
trust  
will

(Titt

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

**American Journal of Philology.** Vol. 34. No. 2. 1913.

M. B. Ogle, *The Classical Origin and Tradition of Literary Conceits*. G. M. Bolling, *Contributions to the Study of Homeric Metre*. R. B. Steele, *The Participial Usage in Cicero's Epistles*. H. R. Fairclough, *Horace's View of the Relations between Satire and Comedy*. H. F. Allen, *Five Greek Mummy-Labels in the Metropolitan Museum, New York*. G. W. Elderkin, *Repetitions in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. J. E. Harris, *Four Verses of the Phoenissae (845-848)*. Reviews: XAPITEΣ Friederich Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht, K. F. Smith. Brief mention: Wilamowitz's *Sappho und Simonides*, Humphreys' *Demosthenes de Corona*, Crönert's *Passow's Greek Lexicon*, von Pöhlmann's *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der Antiken Welt* (new edition), etc., the Editor. Correspondence: A. Gudeman, *The Dialogue of Tacitus once more*.

**Athenaeum** (Pavia). Vol. I, Part III. 1913.

Silvio Ferri, *La Historia de Preliis e le lettere nello Pseudo-Callistene*. Discusses the relation of the *Historia* to the letters (purporting to be of Alexander the Great) in the Pseudo-Callisthenes, and corrects the view of Pfister as to the derivation of the *Historia* from a particular recension of the Greek work. Carlo Pascal, *Culina*. Shows reason for doubting the derivation of late Latin *culina*, 'a burial-place for the poor or for criminals,' from the older *culina*, 'kitchen,' as accepted by the *Thesaurus*, and proposes a derivation from Greek τὰ κοῖλα, 'caverns.' Camillo Cessi, *Orazio e Parini*. On the influence of Horace's Satires on the eighteenth-century satirist Parini. Antonio Amante, *Gli Acrostici nella poesia sepolcrale latina*. Comments on the fifty (or more) acrostic inscriptions to be found among Bücheler's collection of *Carmina Epigraphica* (one acrostic having helped to restore a text), and ascribes them to the second or third century A.D., twenty out of the fifty being Christian. P. L. Ciceri, *De Claudiani in Nilo describendo fontibus*. The writer finds that Claudian is in his *Nilus* on the whole independent of the older writers such as Aristotle or Lucretius, but has points of resemblance to Lucan, and shows an 'Ovidian colour' in the latter part of the poem.

**Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.** 1913.

June 21. C. Preisendanz, *Carmina Anacreontea* post Val. Rosium tertium ed. C. Pr. (Sitzler). An Index verborum has been added to this Teubner text. The reviewer suggests some emendations in the text. J. Marouzeau, *L'emploi du participe présent latin* (Schmalz). Praised.

June 28. G. Tomassetti, *La Campagna Romana* II, III (Wissowa). Vol. II was reviewed by T. Ashby in *C. R.* 1912, pp. 20 sqq. Vol. III contains 'Vie Cassia e Clodia, Flaminia e Tiberina, Labicana e Prenestina. Con 123 figure.' More trustworthy on the Middle Ages than on the classical period. A fourth volume will complete the work.

July 5. R. Schoene, *Aeneae Tactici De obsidione toleranda commentarius*, ed. R. S. (Tittel). Includes a full Index verborum. L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der deutschen Stämme*

bis zum Anfange der Völkerwanderung II, 1, 2 (Wolff). The writer is thoroughly familiar with recent work on the subject. The section on the 'Vorgeschichte der Sweben' specially praised.

July 12. E. Bonnell, *M. Fabii Quintiliani Instit. oratoriae liber decimus*, erkl. von E. B. (Ammon). Sixth edition revised by H. Röhl. F. Münzer, *Cacus der Rinderdieb* (Wissowa). The examination of the story as told by Verg., Prop. and Ovid throws light on their methods.

July 19. Gul. Gemoll, *Xenophontis Institutio Cyri*, rec. G. G. Editio maior (Kalinka). Praised.

July 26. H. W. Garrod, *Manilii Astronomicon lib. II*, ed. by H. W. G. (Kraemer). Highly praised. *Harvard Studies*, Vol. XXII (Tolkiehn). The reviewer discusses at some length J. S. Reid's 'Lucretiana' and R. H. Webb's paper on the MSS of Terence. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, I, 1 (Wissowa). Very warm praise of this journal and the J. H. S.; some interesting remarks on English work in general.

#### Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1913.

June 14. †C. Wachsmuth und O. Hense, *Io. Stobaei Anthologium*, Vol. IV, V. Berlin. 1909, 1913 (H. Schenkl). 'The difference between the restored Stobaeus and what previously was regarded as his work is enormous.'

June 28. C. Werner, *De Anterastis dialogo Pseudoplatonico* (H. Mutschmann). The dialogue is written by an Academic against the Aristotelians. Such works, with the commentaries to Aristotle, form a storehouse of information on the history of the philosophical schools. P. Krüger, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des römischen Rechts*. 2. Aufl. (R. v. Mayr).

July 5. E. Kieckers, *Die Stellung des Verbs im Griechischen*, etc. (H. Meltzer). Gives the laws for the position of the verb in Greek, and shows that the end of the sentence is not on the whole preferred. H. Jordan, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (E. Preuschen).

July 12. W. Gerhäuser, *Der Protreptikos des Poseidonius* (W. W. Jaeger). Sound in method and material, and cautious with regard to the modern view that P. is the father of Neoplatonism, and the tendency to ascribe material to him on insufficient evidence. R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 2. Aufl., II Bd., neugearb. v. C. Stegmann (W. Havers). The reviewer joins in praising this volume, and discusses many details.

July 26. O. Villaret, *Hippocratis De natura hominis liber* (J. Ilberg).

Aug. 2. O. Apelt, *Platon's Dialog Philebos*, übers. und erläutert von O. A. (W. Nestle). Admirable introduction (including a bibliography of modern treatises on the dialogue) and translation.

#### Hermes. Vol. 48. Part 3. 1913.

W. Capelle, *Zur Geschichte der meteorologischen Litteratur*. A. Rosenberg, *Studien zur Entstehung der Plebs*. 1. *Sacrosanctus*. 'Nicht die Tribunen sind sacrosanct, sondern im correcten Sprachgebrauch, die Institutionen auf denen sie beruhen.' 2. The origin of their right. 3. *The Lex Icilia de Aventino*. H. Diels, *Hippokratische Forschungen*. IV. On the *De Arte*, includes a collation of Codex Parisinus Gr. 2253 (A) and Marcianus Gr. 269 (M). H. F. Müller, *Plotinische Studien*, argues that the metaphysics of P. is not based on a system of emanations. E. von Stern, *Solon und Peisistratos*. W. W. Jaeger, *Horaz C. i. 34*: this poem does not celebrate the Roman *Fortuna*, but the Hellenistic idea of *Τύχη*. W. Heraeus, *Lateinische Gedichte auf Inschriften*. No. 108 in Engström's *Carm. Lat. Epig.* is identified with Martial I. 40; No. 301 quotes Tibullus II. 49. S. Brassloff, *Die rechtliche Bedeutung der Inauguration beim Flaminat*. M. Wellmann, *Zu Diokles*.

Miscellen. N. J. Krom, *Die Säule von Besuagar*. R. M. Meyer, *Tacitus und die*

*Arminiuslieder*. A. Gudeman, *Ein neues Zeugnis für die Taciteische Verfasserschaft des Dialogus*. A discussion of Eumenius, *De instaurandis scholis*, paneg. 9. 2. 3, which contains a phrase (*sudibus . . . dimicatur*) which is imitated from *Dialog* 34. 6.

**Le Musée Belge.** XVI. 4.

Réné Nîchard, *The Problem of the Bacchae of Euripides*.

XVII. 1.

N. Holwein, *Select Papyri*. An important article of fifty pages, including translation and copious commentary.

**Mnemosyne.** 41. 3.

J. v. L., J. J. H., *Obituary notice of S. A. Naber*. K. Kuiper, *Ad Satyri fragmentum de vita Euripidis adnotationes duae*. Notes on Satyrus compared with anon. lives; suggestions for the text: discussion of some comic fragments. M. Valetton, *De Iliadis fontibus et compositione*. The Ionic working over of some Dorian motives—Glaucus-Sarpedon: treatment of Heracles-saga: Quellenkritik of the Gods: First part of final summary (to be continued). P. H. Damsté, *Lectiones Valerianae*. Notes and emendations to text of Books III-IV (to be continued). J. W. Beck, *De Controversia quadam Catulliana*. The dedication '*cui dono . . .*' is to be referred neither to all poems nor to I-LX, but to an early group of the lighter poems. P. H. Damsté, *Ova urina quae sunt quaeque fuerunt*. On the various meanings of 'wind-eggs.' H. Wagenvoort, H.f., *Demetrii Triclinii scholia metrica*: additions and improvements in Dindorf's text, taken from a codex Angelicus. J. J. Hartman, *Ad Plutarchi moralia annotationes criticae*: Notes on the *De gloria Atheniensium*. J. W. Beck, *De loco Propertii conclamato*: seeks to establish Vahlen's emendation *si posces, pariamus* . . . in IV 4. 55.

**Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum**, etc. XXXI. 6. 1913.

Th. Plüss, *Die Hadesfahrt des Odysseus als epische Dichtung*. An analysis of *Odyssey* xi. as an artistic whole, itself part of a larger whole. R. Reitzenstein, *Die Areopagrede des Paulus*. Beginning with a defence of Norden's views on ἀνὸς ὁ θεὸς against Harnack's reply, R. criticises H.'s lexicographical evidence for St. Luke's authorship of St. Paul's speech, discusses incidentally many other questions arising out of the *Acts*, and justifies the 'philological' standpoint in the criticism of such texts.

XXXI. 7. 1913.

G. Herbig, *Die nächsten Aufgaben der etruskischen Archäologie*. Pleas for comprehensive works on Etruscan topography, coins, anthropology, religion, furniture, etc.; a half-promise of an illustrated handbook of Etruscan culture; and a suggestion of a central Etruscan Institute. A. Schulten, *Martials Spanische Gedichte*. A topographical commentary, with a map, on M.'s references to Bilbilis and its neighbourhood, by a man who knows his Spain. H. Lamer, review of *Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon*, 1910-1911.

**Philologus.** LXXII. Heft 1. 1913.

O. Immisch, *Der erste platonische Brief*. (1) The intention of the collector of the Letters was to complete Plato's political philosophy—Comparison of the Letters, from this point of view, with the *Politicus*, the *Laws* (especially 739B), and Aristotle. (2) The first letter is from Dexippus (vid. Diod. 13 and 14) to Dionysius I. Philistus may have included this letter in his history, and Timaeus in his, in something like its present form. From the latter it was taken over into the Platonic collection. R. Hirtzel, *Ovōia*. A history of its two meanings—(1) property, (2) essence. How the former, which is the earlier, produced the latter. G. Kafka, *Zu Theophrasts*

De sensu. A consideration of the fragments (Diels' *Vorsokratiker*), especially of their matter. O. S. v. Fleschenburg, *Die Technik des Bildeinsatzes*. The description of a work of art, designed to link together the introduction and body of a work, as a branch of sophistic technique. Four elements essential: (1) localization of the work of art, (2) description of it, (3) explanation, (4) moral. Examples from—Cebes, Petronius, Lucian (*Toxaris*), Pseudo-Lucian (*Erotes*), Longus, Achilles Tatius. R. Asmus, *Zur Kritik und Erklärung von Julian Ep. 3\* und 35*. Ep. 3\* probably addressed to Sallustius, to be dated 359 A.D. The supposed connection between 3\* and 35 (also considered) is baseless. H. Wingels, *De ordine libellorum Lucianeorum*. A full review of the five oldest manuscripts, starting from this point. W. Schmid, *Zu Virgil's Catalepton*. Suggests II. 2-5 *iste, terre, rhetor, usquequaque vos totus*, | Thucydides Britannus, Atticae *φύβους* | tau Gallicum, *μιν et σφιν εἶ μάλα illisit*, | *εἶτα omnia ista uerba miscuit fratri*; X. 23 *pyxinumque pectinem*; XIV. 9 *marmoreusque tibi atque ignicoloribus alis* | in morem posita stabit Amor pharetra.' Eb. Nestle, *Beobachtungen zu den lateinischen Evangelien*. Statistics (1) for the various translations of *ὁ δέ, οἱ δέ*, and (2) for *ait, dixit, inquit*. G. Landgraf, *Lucilius Fr. 417 M*. 'si tricosus bovinatorque.' Tricosus justified and explained by Columella II, 1, 16. W. v. Voigt, *Zu Cicero und Germanicus*. Cic. *De Legg.* II. 9. 22. 'Sos leto datos' read *avos*. Germanicus, *Phaenon*. 665 sq. keep *Cancer*. The reference is astrological. A. Zimmermann, *Zur Duenosinschrift*. Suggests a goddess *Oitensia* who 'praest rebus utendis.' A. Laudien, *Plutarchea*. A list of MSS. of Plutarch's *Lives* hitherto unused.

**Revue de l'Instruction publique en Belgique.** LV. 1, 2.

Boisacq, *Etymological Studies*. J. de Decker, *Ad Sen. Rhet. Suas.* II. 10.

LV. 3, 4.

G. Cahnert, Choephoroi vv. 691-699. J. de Decker, *Juvenal* I. vv. 81-86, a new interpretation.

LXVI. 1, 2.

C. Brakham, *Notes on Roman Historians*.

**Revue des Études grecques.** XXV. 113, 114.

G. Sotiriadis, *Prehistoric Excavations in Phocis*. An important article with illustrations. A. Boucher, *Greek Tactics*, an illuminating article by a military officer. K. Kniper, *The Marriage of Cydippe*. An exhaustive study on the pre-nuptial rites of Naxos.

XXV. 115.

E. Michon, remainder of article on *The Sculptures of Aegina and Phigalia*.

**Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.** LXVIII. 3. 1913.

P. Corssen, *Ist die Alexandra dem Tragiker Lykophron abzusprechen?* The poem is to be dated after Pyrrhus and before 197 B.C. External evidence and internal analysis both go to confirm the authorship of Lycophron, the tragic poet, and give the work a greater historical interest and value. K. Ziegler, *Zum Zeushymnus des Kallimachos*. The connection of Zeus with earthly kings and the forms of prayer in antiquity. P. Maas, *Zu Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusen*. In v. 2 read *ἀπολεῖ μ' ἄλυν*, in v. 277 *ἴα· σπείδε*, in 601-6 *ἑγγράται τάρ*, at the same time transposing 603 and 604. In 808-9 read *ἄντρος* for *αὐτός* with Kuster's *φίσει*. Zu Menander. On the tragic style in the *Perikeir.*, vv. 66-121, nom. for voc. in women's names in -is, various emendations by use of the form *παῖ*; notes on text of Cithair. 46 sq. J. Merk, *Antiochus und Stratonike*. Study of different accounts and use of romantic details: relation of these to the Hippolytus. U. Kahrstedt, *Die Martyrerakten von Lugdunum* 177. Argues for credibility of narrative in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1 sqq. S. Brassloff, *Zur Lehre von den Freilassungen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Argues (against Mitteis) that

representation in *manumissio uindicta* was not very rare under the empire. C. Atzert, *Handschriftliches zu Ciceros De Officiis*. Notes on a twelfth century MS. at Brussels (No. 10036) and its place among the contaminated MSS. W. A. Baehrens, *Zu Curtius Rufus*. On the clausulae in *Curt. Rufus*. Notes on text based on these. M. L. Strack, *In Sachen Abderas*. Defends himself against attacks by Wilamowitz in *Sappho u. Simonides*. *Miszellen*. C. O. Zuretti on *Anth. Pal.* v. 191. S. Sudhaus, *On Samia* 327, *Ciris*, v. 48. P. E. Sonnenberg, *De Ciceronis Officina*. E. Hohl, *Tacitus und der jüngere Plinius*.

# Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1913.

May 26. Pauly, *Real-Encyclopädie*. Neue bearb. von W. Kroll. 15 Halbb. *Helikon-Hestia* (F. Harder). F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*. 2 Aufl. (P. Wessner). A. Slijpen, *Disputatio critica de carminibus Horatii sex quae dicuntur odae Romanae* (H. Belling). R. C. Kukula, *Quintilian's Interpretation von Horaz* C. 1, 14 (G. Friedrich). 'K. is mistaken in interpreting the ode as a "propempticon" for Octavian.'

June 2. A. Calderini, *Ὀμνηστία* (Nohl). 'Collects all that we know.' G. Dickinson, *Catalogue of the Akropolis Museum*. I (Br. Schröder). T. L. Heath, *The Method of Archimedes recently discovered by Heiberg* (M. K. Grober). A translation with historical introduction. E. Capps, *Menander, The Hero, Epitrepontes, Perikeiromene and Samia*, ed. by E. C. (K. F. W. Schmidt). 'Renders excellent service to the study of M.' E. A. Sonnenschein, *A new Latin Grammar* (H. Blase). 'Cannot be overlooked by anyone interested in the future of this study.'

June 9. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Fr. Harder). 'Passes over no difficulty and contains the results of the latest research.' E. Rosenberg, *Zum Verständniss des Horaz* (G. Friedrich). A Festschrift containing (1) the use of the fut. in Horace and the Elegiac poets, by E. R.; (2) on the fourth Pythian ode, by E. Lohan; (3) an hiatus in Demosthenes, by F. Schiller. E. Engström, *Carmina Latina epigraphica post editam collectionem Buchelerianam* (C. Ganzemüller). O. Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Novellenkränze Lukians* (P. Schulze). 'Important and interesting.'

June 16. J. Wright, *Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language* (R. Wagner). 'Especially useful to those who cannot read other languages than their own.' L. Robin, *La théorie platonicienne de l'amour* (G. Lehnert). Pöhlig, *Die Römeroden des Horaz* (K. Löschhorn). C. Plini, *Epistularum libri IX, Epistularum ad Traianum liber, Panegyricus*, rec. R. C. Kukula. Ed. II (M. Stangl).

June 23. H. Weinstock, *De Erotico Lysiaco* (B. v. Hagen). 'Strengthens the view that the Phaedrus is a "Programmschrift."' W. Wegehaupt, *Ciceros Rede pro C. Rabirio* (K. Löschhorn). 'Maintains against O. Schulthess that this speech was delivered before the Comitia Centuriata in a trial for high treason.' J. van Wageningen, *Auli Persi Flacci Saturae* ed. J. v. W. (R. Helm). 'Contains all that is worth knowing.'

June 30. A. Monti, *Index Archiloeus cum Homero Hesiodo et Herodoteo comparatus et De Archilochi elocutione* (L. Weber). 'Both works show that the final word on the vocabulary of Archilochus has not yet been said.' J. Kessler, *Isocrates und die panhellenische Idee* (H. Swoboda). 'A noticeable contribution.' M. Haupt, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii Carmina a M. H. recognita*, ed. 7 a J. Vahlen cur. et a R. Helm ed. I. (G. Friedrich). M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. II. *Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian*. 2. Hälfte. *Vom Tode des Augustus bis zur Regierung Hadrians*. 3. Aufl. (Fr. Harder). V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie*. 2 Aufl. II. (C. Wessely).

July 7. S. Reinach, *Répertoire des vases peints grecs et étrusques.—Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine.—Répertoire de reliefs grecs et romains.—Recueil de têtes.—*



*Bibliothèque des monuments figurés* (H. Lamer). G. Hertig, *Die etruskische Leinwand-rolle des Agramer Nationalmuseums* (A. Walde). G. Hempl, *Early Etruscan Inscriptions* (A. Walde). A mistaken attempt to connect Etruscan with Latin. M. Haupt, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii Carmina a M. H. recognita*. Ed. 7 a J. Vahlen cur. et a R. Helm ed. II. (G. Friedrich). 'This edition of Vahlen's has nothing to do with science.'

July 14. O. Rössner, *Beiträge zur Lösung der homerischen Frage* (K. Löschhorn). On *Iliad*, Books 1-3. W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, *Greek Inscriptions from Sardes*. II. (W. Larfeld). Guil. Quandt, *De Baccho ab Alexandri aetate in Asia Minore culto* (W. Larfeld). H. Jacobsohn, *Altitalische Inschriften*, ausgewählt von H. J. (A. Walde). J. Schröter, *De Ciceronis Catone maiore* (W. Isleib). A. Lang, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kaisers Tiberius* (Ph. Fabia). 'A work of sound method and good judgment but of small result.'

July 21. K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*. 4. Aufl. von A. Thumb (M. Güntert). A. Römer, *Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik* (F. Stürmer). 'A standard work.' A. Boucher, *L'Anabase de Xénophon, avec un commentaire historique et militaire* (H. Philipp). 'Diligent, but partly superfluous and much too controversial.' K. Gatzert, *De nova comedia quaestiones onomatologicae* (E. Wüst). 'Interesting.' Th. Düring, *Zur Überlieferung von Senekas Tragödien* (K. Löschhorn).

July 28 (double number). P. Jouquet, *Papyrus de Théadelphie*, édité par P. J. (C. Wessely). Gr. Semeka, *Ptolemäisches Prozessrecht* (A. Wiedemann). 'Interesting and valuable.' M. San Nicolò, *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer* (A. Wiedemann).

## LANGUAGE.

### Indogermanische Forschungen. XXXII. Band, 1, 2 Hefte. 1913.

Brugmann, αἰρέω cognate of ὁρμή, Old Ind. śīsar-ti ('pursues'), Welsh herw [herw-heliwr, 'poacher'], ἔλκω from a root sel- which appears in Welsh helw ('possession'), Gaulish *Lugusēlwa* ('possession of Lugus'); ἰσθίω, ἰσθίω in *Homer*; ἰσθίω comes from an imperative \*ἰσθί (= Old Ind. addhi) which once existed beside ἔδω and ἔδμεναι. E. Kieckers, *Schaltesätze* (e.g. 'said I', 'inquit,' etc.) in *Latin, Romance, and Modern German*, an examination of the relative frequency of the verbs used (*dicūt, aūt, etc.*) and their position in the sentences which they quote. G. Herbig, *Old Italic Verbforms, fīfiked* (in *med fīfiked*) a Faliscan reduplicated Aorist; Fal. *fīfiked* = *fīfīqont* 3rd pl. of an old Aorist like *πείσθοντ, τέταγοντ*. Oscan *fīfikus* is a 2nd. sing. fut. perf. from the same verb; Latin preferred the s Preterite *finxit*; Fal. *porded*, 'he offered,' a compound of *dare*, *por* = Gk. *παρ*, *porded* by haplology from *por-de-ded*; Fal. *douiad* = Lat. *duat*. E. Fraenkel adds a supplement to his book on the suffixes -τήρ, -τωρ, -της (1910-1912), with an investigation of their metaphorical significance in Greek. W. Havers discusses *αβρυή ταύτα* in inscriptions; it is used (1) as a mere exclamation, especially with a vocative; (2) as a mark of quotation like our 'inverted comma' [cf. 'δὰ' τοῦτ' ἔπος γυναικοπληθὺς ὁμιλος ἀπὸν Aesch. *Persae* 122]; (3) to denote the beginning or end of a document = *Finis* or a mere 'full stop.' The Latin *tantum* was used in the same way; cf. L. *Gratius Eutyches domum aeternam uius sibi curauit ne heredem rogaret*. Ταῦτα, and L. *Critonius L. L. Felix sibi et Critoniae L. L. Rufilla. Tantum*.

# INDICES

## I.—GENERAL INDEX.

### A.

- acrostic inscriptions in Bücheler's *Carmina Epigraphica*, 283  
*āyena yānti* (Sk.) = *equo eunt*, 202  
 Adam on the argument of Plato, *Protag.* 351 B—356 C, 100 ff.; and the separatists on the *Republic*, 268  
 adjectives coupled to abl. abs., 24 f.  
 Aeneas Tacticus and stichometry, 256 ff.  
   corruption in archetype of M due to—  
     (a) omission of line, 257 ff.  
     (b) omission of words, 262 f.  
     (c) transposition, 260 ff.  
   ordinary instances of lipography in, 256  
   text checked by Julius Africanus, 261 ff.  
 Aeschylus, *Septem contra Thebas*, plot of, 73 ff.  
   recollection of the Persians a factor in, 77  
   strikes a keynote in opening words of plays, *ib.*  
*Aetna*, date of, 136  
 Albericus Mythologus, date and sources of, 136 f.  
 Allen (T. W.), on Pisistratus and Homer, 33 ff.  
   on the canonicity of Homer, 221 ff.  
 Antigone's tomb, 212  
 Ardys and Mithridates (coll. Liu. xxxiii. 19), 66  
 Aristides Quintilianus and the Greek modes, 93  
 Aristophanes, *Thesm.*, suggestions on, 286  
 Aristotelian [*Problems*], date of the, 97 f.  
 Aristotle and Thucydides, 214  
 Artemis-cult at Cumae, 68  
 'articulation' in Catullus' poems, 125 (and n.), 128 (and n.)  
 Athenian interpolations in the *Iliad*, the question of, 46 ff.  
 Athenodorus Calvus, 35 (n.)  
 Augustus, horoscope of, 109 ff.

### B.

- Bacchylides and Naevius, 213  
 Bataui, in, in Julius Caesar, 139  
 bees as agents of punishment for infidelity, 180  
 Berlin papyrus fragment of Hesiod, 218 f.  
 blindness a punishment for adultery, 180 ff.  
 Borinus or Bormus, story of, 184, 187  
*bousculade* (*la*) expressive of Lat. *turba*, 121  
 Britain—how far Romanized, 138  
 Bücheler's *Carm. Epigr.*, 960; the Catulus of, 58

### C.

- Caesar and the Bataui, 139  
 legal expiration of command in Gaul, 141  
 canonicity of Homer, the, 221 ff.  
 general view of 'Homer,' 221 f.  
 textual additions, 222 ff.  
   Hesiod, 222 f.  
   Cycle, 223  
   Hymns, 223 f.  
   saec. VI., 224  
   saec. V., 224 ff.  
   saec. IV., 226  
   Alexandrian, 226 ff.  
   later than saec. IV., 228 ff.  
   summary and table of results, 229 f.  
   supplementary or detachable evidence, 230 f.  
   the question of ψ 297—ω fin., 231 ff.  
*car*, from Lat. *quare* (?), 144  
*carati=colit*, 203  
*cardiyati* (Sk.), *ib.*  
 Caspari (M. O. B.), on the Egyptian expedition of 459-4 B.C., 198 ff.  
*Catalogue*, suggested interpolations in the, 45 ff., 48 (n.)  
 Catulliana (D. A. Slater), 122 ff.  
 Catullus, 'articulation' of poems in, 125 (and n.), 128 (and n.)  
   variants of G (*Codex Sangermanensis*) in, 122  
   the dedication *Cui dono*, 285  
 Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, tales from, 184 ff.  
 Cicero, *de Officiis*, twelfth-century MS. of, at Brussels, 287  
 Clark's lectures on stichometry, 256  
 Clerk Colvill ballad, the, 184, 186  
 Classical Association, the, 72  
 Claudian's *Nilus*, sources of, 283  
 Corinthian War, a problem in the, 132  
 Crito and the alleged attempt to bribe Socrates jurors, 162  
 Ctesias' account of the Egyptian expedition of 459-4 B.C., 199  
   credibility compared with that of Herodotus, *ib.*  
 Cycle, date of the, 42 ff.  
   passages bearing on the subject, 43 f.  
   poems of the, annalistic, 41, 43 ff.  
 Cyrus on life after death, 168

## D.

- date of Aetna, 136  
 of Manilius iv., 111 f.  
 of the Aristotelian [*Problemata*], 97 f.  
 of the Cyclic poems, 42 ff.  
 of the Epic Revival, 44 f.
- datives in Thucydides, 243, 244, 250, 251  
*de tunica lineata* (Iuu. iii. 147 sqq.), 196 f.  
 Friedlaender's view criticized, *ib.*
- Delphi and Pythagoras, 160 (n.)
- Denniston (J. D.), on some recent theories of the Greek modes, 83 ff.
- Dickins (G.), on the true cause of the Peloponnesian War, 62: see also 59 ff. and C. Q. for October, 1911
- Dieuchidas on Pisistratus (or Solon) and Homer, 34, 46, 50
- differing meanings of the same set of words, 28
- Diogenes Laertius i. 2, 56; note on, 134
- Dionysius Thrax, scholia on, and Pisistratus, 36 f.
- 'division' of notes, 106
- divisions of human life, the, 140
- does the *Odyssey* imitate the *Iliad*? 234 ff.
- dramatic significance of words in the Greek Tragedians, 74 f.
- dream of Ennius, the, 188 ff.

## E.

- EBA POON (Theoc. *Id.* i. 139 sq.), 176 ff.  
 meaning of phrase, and interpretation of the Daphnis legend, 177 ff.  
 references to Daphnis in literature, 179
- 'Sicilian' folk-tale regarding Daphnis, 179 ff.  
 stories of similar nympholepts, 183 f.  
 illustrated from Child's *Ballads*, 184 ff.
- the 'Daphnis' spring, 183 (and n.), 186 f.
- Egyptian expedition of 459-4 B.C., the, 198 ff.  
 Thucydides' account of the Athenian armament, 198 f.  
 checked by Ctesias, 199  
 by the 'Erechtheis inscription,' 200  
 unlikely from (a) home troubles, (b) certainty of combined attack, 200 f.
- εἰδωλον* (or *simulacrum*) as opposed to *anima*, 195
- Eisagoge*, the pseudo-Euclidean and the Greek modes, 93, 96 f.
- Ennius, the dream of, 183 ff.  
 authorities bearing on the subject, 189 ff.  
 facts deduced therefrom and Ennius' conception, 192 f.  
 instances of similar *εἰδωλα*, 194 f.
- Epic Revival, traditional date of the, 44 f.
- epitaph of Heluia Prima, 58
- Epizephyrian Locri, results of excavations at, 140
- 'Erechtheis inscription' and the Egyptian expedition of 459-4 B.C., 200
- euphemism, importance of to the Greek, 74
- Euripides, *σοφίσματα* of, 164 ff.
- Euthyphro on Socrates' δαίμονιον, 158, 170, 172 f.
- Evelyn-White (Hugh G.), Hesiodea, 217 ff.

## F.

- Fay (Edwin W.), Syntax and Etymology, 202 ff.  
*axitia* quasi 'paint-stick,' 205 f.  
*axitosus*, 204 f.  
*culauti*, 203 f.  
*nubere*, 206 f.  
*utor, uescor*, 202 f.
- Ferguson (A. S.), on the impiety of Socrates, 157 ff.
- Festus, notes on, 115 ff.  
 his habit of completing quotations irrespective of sense, 117, 119  
 MS. of his epitome of Verrius, 115  
 Paulus' mistakes in epitomizing, 118
- Fortuna, cult of, 208
- Friedlaender's view of Iuu. iii. 147 sqq.; combated, 196 f.
- Fries' development of the rise of pastoral poetry, 176

## G.

- Garrod (E. W.), on the epitaph of Heluia Prima, 58  
 Gemini, birth under, 20 (and n.)
- Geneva papyrus (No. 94) and fragments of Hesiod, 219 f.
- Greek modes, some recent theories of the, 83 ff.  
 Cook Wilson on, 92 ff. (see also 85)  
 Macran on, 87 ff. (see also 86)  
 Monro on, 84 ff.  
 recapitulatory, 97 f.  
 summing up, 98 f.  
 the importance of pitch in, *ib.*  
 verb, position of the, 284  
 verbs meaning 'to import from abroad,' usage of, 157 (and n.)
- Grundy (G. B.), on the true cause of the Peloponnesian War, 59 ff.: see also 62 and C. Q. for October, 1911

## H.

- Hackforth (R.), on the modification of plan in Plato's *Republic*, 265 ff.
- Hannibalic War, contributions to the, 69
- Harrison (E.), note on Sophocles, *Trach.* 1064 sq., 133 f.  
 on a problem in the Corinthian War, 132
- Hardie (W. R.), on the dream of Ennius, 188 ff.
- Havet (Louis), note on Plautus, *Bacch.* 107, 120 f.
- Haydn's dictum on music, 83
- Hellen. Oxyrhynch.* and Xenophon, 214
- Heluia Prima, epitaph of, 58
- Hermann's (K. F.) interpretation of Theocritus' Thyrsis-song, 178
- Herodotus and Ctesias, credibility of, 199  
 the medical writer, 138
- Hesiodea (Hugh G. Evelyn-White), 217 ff.
- Hesiodic *Theogonia*, authorship of the, 142  
 vision and its imitators, the, 188 ff.
- Historia Augusta*, date of the, 68

- Homer, bucolic diaeresis in, 71  
*Odyssey*—does it imitate the *Iliad*? 234 ff.  
 (1) cases of alleged borrowing or imitation, 235 ff.  
 (2) cases of additional parody, 240 ff.  
 (a) generally, 240 f.  
 (b) on undignified subjects, 241 f.  
*pluralis maiestatis* in, 129 ff.  
 the canonicity of, 221 ff.  
 vowel-contraction in, 71  
 Homeric tradition and Pisistratus, the, 33 ff.  
 authorities on the collection of the lays, 35 ff.  
 on the Panathenaica, 33 f.  
 on the question of interpolation, 38 ff.  
 on the transport of the poems to Athens, 34 f.  
**Housman (A. E.)**, notes on Persius, 12 ff.  
 on Manilius, Augustus, Tiberius, Capricornus, and Libra, 109 ff.  
**Hunter (L. W.)**, on Aeneas Tacticus and stichometry, 256 ff.  
 Hylas, story of, 184, 187

## I.

- Iliad*, suggested plan of the, 139  
 and *Odyssey*, tropes in, *ib.*  
 impiety of Socrates, 157 ff.  
 independent negatives in Greek, 244  
 interpolation, real significance of, 47  
 in Manilius iv. 776, 113 f.  
 suggested in the *Catalogue*, 45 ff., 48 (n.)  
 Ionic hexameter, origin of the, 71  
 Isidore's 'Institutionum disciplinae' and 'de numeris', 68  
 Italian painters and sculptors, mediaeval, compared with Homer and the Cyclic writers, 42

## J.

- Jacobsohn's Law of Hiatus and Syllaba Anceps, 4  
 Julius Africanus and the text of Aeneas Tacticus, 261 ff.  
 Juvenal iii. 147 sqq., note on, 196 f.

## K.

- Krishna, story of, and the Thyrsis-song in Theocritus, 176

## L.

- Lachmann on Lucretius ii. 301, 26  
 LANGUAGE: SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 71 f., 144, 216, 288. See further under 'Summaries.'  
 Latin accent, 71  
 authors, notes and suggestions on, 54 ff., 105 ff.  
 music, 214  
 prohibitives, tenses in, 144  
 Leaf on interpolations in the *Iliad*, 47  
 Leo on text of Plautus, *Truculentus*, 4, 119  
 lexicographical variations with similarly constructed verbs, 206  
**Lindsay (W. M.)**, notes on Festus, 115 ff.  
 notes on Plautus, 1 ff.: see also 119

- LITERATURE AND GENERAL: SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 63 ff., 135 ff., 208 ff., 283 ff. See further under 'Summaries.'  
 Longinus' treatment of 'pathos', 215  
 Lucian's *πλοῖον ἢ εὐχάλ.* *ib.*  
 Lucretius iv. 1223 sqq., note on, 282  
 v., source of, 66  
 and Epicureanism in the Middle Ages, 214  
*Ludus de morte Claudii*, suggestions on the, 142  
 Lycophron the tragedian, poem of, 286

## M.

- Mackail on the potency of the spoken word in Sophocles, 74 f.  
 Magna Graecia, end of Pythagorean supremacy in, 140  
 Magnes' Lydian epos, 44 (and n.)  
 Manilius iv., date of, 111 f.  
 iv. 776, interpolation in, 113 f.  
 Manilius, Augustus, Tiberius, Capricornus, and Libra, 109 ff.  
*μάκρως*, status of the, 167  
 Megarian antiquaries and the Pisistratus legend, 39, 49 ff.  
 Menander, remarks on, 286  
 metopes in public buildings, 139  
 Milton quoted, 246  
 Mime and the Idyll, possible origin of, 142  
 Mimesis in Greek literature, 139 f., 142  
 misdivision of continuous words in MSS., 68 f.  
 modification of plan in Plato's *Republic*, the, 265 ff.  
 Monro on imitations of the *Iliad* in the *Odyssey*, 234 ff.  
 moon's influence on astrology, 110 ff.  
*Moretum* of Virgil (?), the, 208  
 MS. of Aeneas Tacticus, 256 ff.  
 of Festus' epitome of Verrius, 115  
 Murray's theory of the situation of Oedipus, 75 (n.)

## N.

- notes and suggestions on Latin authors, 54 ff., 105 ff.  
 on Festus, 115 ff.  
 on Plautus, 1 ff., 119, 120 f.  
 on Persius, 12 ff.  
 on Trebatius the Velian, 273 ff.  
 nouns in -is originally adjectives, 117  
*nubere*, the *b* is rather from *bh* than *dh*, 206  
 nympholepts, stories of, 180, 183 ff.

## O.

- Oitensia, a goddess (?), 286  
 Old Italic verb-forms, 288  
 Orphism and Plato's *Gorgias*, 214  
 Ovid, quotations from Catullus in, 124 (and n.)  
 Oxyrhynchus papyrus fragment of Hesiod, 217 f.

## P.

- Pallis (Alex.)**, note on Diogenes Laertius i. 2, 56  
 134  
 Panathenaic festival and Homer, the, 33 f.  
 papyrus fragments of Hesiod, 217 ff.

- paronomasia on names in the Tragedians, 133 f.  
 'partitive' gen. in Greek, 144  
 pastoral poetry, novel views on genesis of, 176 f.  
 Paul's (St.) speech on Mars hill, 285  
 Paulus' mistakes in epitomizing Festus, 118  
 peacocks emblematic of a poetic soul, 193 (n.)  
 Peloponnesian War, true cause of, Dickens on, 62;  
 Grundy on, 59 ff.  
 Pergamum and Pisistratus, 35, 37 f., 51  
 PERIODICALS: see under 'Summaries'  
 Persius, notes on, 12 ff.  
 Petermann der Diemringer, story of, 185  
 Petronius' *Satyricon*, scene of, 141  
 Phillimore on Catullus ii., 123 f.  
 Philoxenus and the Greek modes, 98  
 Pisistratus and Homer, 33 ff.  
     authorities for connexion between, 33 ff.  
     disposed of by date of Epic Cycle, 40 ff.  
     how the legend arose, 49 f.  
     regarded as a philosopher, 35, 50 ff.  
 Plato and Xenophon's alleged evasions as to  
 Socrates' impiety, 157, 159, 161 f., 167 ff.,  
 172 ff.  
 Plato, *Protagoras* 351 B—356 C, argument of,  
 100 ff.  
     *Republic*, modification of plan in, 265 ff.  
     Cornford's views criticized, 265 f., 270 f.  
     differentiation of books ii.-iv. and vi.-vii.,  
     268 ff., 271 f.  
     origin of tripartite parallelism, 266 ff.,  
     271 f.  
     the cardinal virtues, 266, 268 ff., 272  
     *Sophist* 244 C, note on, 52 f.  
 Plato's *Letters*, 285  
 Platt (Arthur), note on Lucretius iv. 1223-1228,  
 282  
 Plautus, *Bacchides* 107, note on, 120 f.  
     *Truculentus*, text of, 4, 119  
 Plautus, notes on, 1 ff.  
     attraction of antecedent, 5 f.  
     hypermetric exclamations, 2 f.  
     influence of Ennius on (?), 9  
     line-division, 3  
     metrical treatment of pronouns, 4  
     pleonastic forms, 5  
     tribrach opening of iambic lines, 7 f.  
 pleonasm in Thucydides, 253  
 plot of the *Septem contra Thebas*, 73 ff.  
*pluralis maiestatis* in Homer, 129 ff.  
     with *hýtrepos*, 129 f.  
     *hýtrepos*, 130  
     verbs, 131  
 Plutarch's authorship of the *Septem Sapientum*  
*Conuiuium*, 139  
 Pontus, dialect of, 144  
 Posidonius and Neoplatonism, 284  
     of Apamea, 142  
     of Olibia, *ib.*  
 Præchae (F.), notes on Trebatius the Velian, 273 ff.  
 Prescott (Henry W.), on *ἑβὰ βόων* (Theocr. *Id.*  
*i.* 139 *sq.*), 176 ff.  
 presents and futures combined in Greek, 247 f.  
 problem in the Corinthian War, 132  
 'Proclus' note on Hesiod, *Op. et Di.* 169 and 169  
*a-d*, 219 f.  
 pseudo-sanctity of the traditional text of Horace, 56  
 Pylos and the *Hymn to Hermes*, 45 (and n.)  
 Pythagorean influence on Socrates, 159 f.  
     supremacy in Magna Graecia, end of, 140  
 Q.  
 quadrilateral fields, artistic treatment of, 67  
 Quintus and Virgil, 142  
 quotations from Catullus in Ovid, 124 (and n.)  
     in Festus, regard to completeness rather than  
     sense, 117, 119  
 R.  
 recent theories of the Greek modes, 83 ff.  
 Reitzenstein's explanation of the Thyrsis-song in  
 Theocritus, 176 f.  
 religion and ethics *versus* lay poetry, 67  
 repetition of recurring words in inscriptions, etc., 68  
 Rhœocus and the hamadryad, story of, 180  
 Richards (H.), Thucydides, 145 ff., 243 ff.  
     Part I. Further dislocations, 145 ff.  
     Part II. Miscellaneous Emendations, 153  
     ff., 243 ff.  
 S.  
 Schlumberger Mirror, a reading of the, 141  
 scholia on *Iliad* ii. (Oxyrh. Pap. viii.), 140  
 Schwartz' interpretation of Theocritus' Thyrsis-  
 song, 178  
 Scott's *Athenian Interpolations in Homer*, referred  
 to, 47, 48 (n.)  
*Septem contra Thebas*, plot of the, 73 ff.  
 Shakespeare quoted, 106  
 Sheppard (J. T.), on the plot of the *Septem contra*  
*Thebas*, 73 ff.  
 Shewan (A.), does the *Odyssey* imitate the *Iliad*?  
 234 ff.  
     on the *pluralis maiestatis* in Homer, 129 ff.  
 Sigeion, the affair of, 34, 46, 48  
 Sittl and the question of imitation in the *Odyssey*,  
 234 ff.  
 Slater (D. A.), Catulliana, 122 ff.  
 Slavic and Romance wooing customs, 206 f.  
 Smyly's views on Manilius ii. 507 *sqq.*, 109 ff.  
 (and n.)  
 'snood,' 206  
 Socrates, impiety of, 157 ff.  
     accusation and legal question, 157 f.  
     alleged connexion with Pythagoreans, 159 f.  
     foreign friendships, 160 ff.  
     Orphic doctrine of immortality, 166 ff.  
     the 'divine sign,' 169 ff.  
     why a fitting object of attack, 174 f.  
     traditional view summarized and upheld, 175  
     sophistic technique in works of art, 286  
 Sophocles, an artist in words, 74 ff.  
     especially in the Oedipus legend, 75  
     (and n.)  
 'Lyxevral, sources of, 139  
 Trach. 1064 *sq.*, note on, 133 f.

- Staufenberg (Peter von), story of, 185 f.  
 stereotyped phrases in language, 52  
 stichometry and Aeneas Tacticus, 256 ff.  
**Stocks** (J. L.), on the argument of Plato, *Protagoras* 351 B—356 C, 100 ff.  
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 63 ff.,  
 135 ff., 208 ff., 283 ff.  
   American Journal of Philology, 63, 135, 208,  
     283  
   Athenaeum (Pavia), 208, 283  
   Berliner philologische Wochenschrift, 63 f.,  
     135 f., 209 f., 283 f.  
   Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen, 136 f.  
   Classical Philology, 65, 137, 210  
   Classical Weekly (New York), 65, 137, 210 f.  
   Classical Literaturezeitung, 65 f., 137 f., 211,  
     284  
   Glotta, 71  
   Hermathena, 138  
   Hermes, 66, 138 f., 211 f., 284 f.  
   Indogermanische Forschungen, 71, 144, 216,  
     288  
   Journal of Philology, 67, 212  
   Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de  
     Paris, 144  
   Mnemosyne, 67, 139, 212, 285  
   Musée belge, 67, 285  
   Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum,  
     etc., 67, 139 f., 212 f., 285  
   Philologus, 68, 140, 213, 285 f.  
   Revue de l'Instruction publique en Belgique,  
     286  
   Revue de Philologie, 140 f., 213 f.  
   Revue des Études grecques, 141, 286  
   Rheinisches Museum, 68 f., 141 f., 214, 286 f.  
   Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione classica,  
     69, 142, 214  
   Wiener Studien, 215  
   Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 70,  
     142 f., 215 f., 287 f.  
   Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung,  
     72, 216  
 super-names in the Roman Empire, 71  
 swan-song of Socrates, the, 159 f.  
 syntax and etymology, 202 ff.  
   of concord in Latin, 69  
 Syracuse, topography of, 213
- T.
- Tacitus on Fate, 142  
 Tennyson quoted, 195  
 terminations of words interchanged, 250  
 'that,' ungrammatical repetition of, 248  
 Theocritus, *Idyll.* i. (in special reference to *Ἰβη*  
*ῖδω*), 176 ff.
- Theognis and Solon, 51 (n.)  
*Theogonia*, authorship of the, 142  
 Thessalian monasteries, discovery of MSS. in, 67  
 Thucydidea (H. Richards), 145 ff., 243 ff.  
 Thucydides and the cause of the Peloponnesian  
 War, 61  
 Tiberius' horoscope, 112 f.  
 Tibullus, discursiveness of, 213  
 Tomi, Greek inscription from, 214  
 Trebatius the Velian, notes on, 273 ff.  
   and Cicero's *Topica*, 274  
   his friendship with Horace, 276  
   his nickname of Testa, 274 f.  
   his Velian estate, 276 ff.  
     the *lotus* on, 276 ff., 280  
     was Cicero thinking of Velia or Rome  
       278 f.  
   where did Cicero stay at Velia? 273 ff.  
   who was *Talva* (ad *Att.* xvi. 6. 1)? 274 f.  
     qy. misreading for *Testa*! *id.*  
 true cause of the Peloponnesian War, 59 ff.: see  
   also C. Q. for October, 1911  
**Tucker** (T. G.), notes and suggestions on Latin  
 authors, 54 ff., 105 ff.  
*tunica lintea*, note on, 196 f.  
 Tzetzes and Pisistratus, 37, 40
- U.
- Uffenbach at the Cambridge University Library, 136  
 unfaithfulness of legendary heroes, punishments for,  
 181 sqq. (and nn.)  
*utor*, accus. construction of, 203
- V.
- van Wageningen, J.: see Wageningen (van), J.  
 verbs meaning 'to export from abroad' in Greek,  
 usage of, 157 (and n.)  
 Verrall's theory of the *choreutae* in Euripides'  
*Heracles*, 188 (n.)  
 Virgil and Quintus, 142  
*Ecl.* iv. 61, the 'ten months of tedium' in, 140
- W.
- Wageningen (van), J., de tunica lintea (ad *Iuu.* iii.  
 147 sqq.), 196 f.  
 Wilson (J. Cook), note on Plato, *Sophist* 244 C,  
 52 f.
- X.
- Xenophon, *Hellen.* *Oxyrhynch.* and, 214  
 on the 'divine sign' of Socrates, 173 f.  
 on the immortality of the soul, 167 f.

## II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

### A.

- Aelian:—  
*V.H.* xiii. (14), 35 f.  
Aeneas Tacticus (xviii. 13), 262; (xxii. 17), 259;  
(xxxvii. 2), 260 f.; (xxviii. 3), 262 f.; (xxviii. 7),  
258 f.; (xxix. 4), 261; (xxxi. 16-20), 263 f.;  
(xxxi. 26 coll. Hdt. viii. 128), 257 f.; (xxxi. 32),  
261 f.; (xxxiii. 2), 259 f.; (xl. 3), 260  
Aleman (38), 142  
Andocides:—  
*de Pace* (5), 201 (n.)  
*Anth. Pal.* v. (191), 69; vii. (42), 188 f.; (486) 178;  
(442), 36  
Apollonius Rhodius:—  
*Argonautica* i. (644), 178: (1208, 1221, 1239),  
187  
Aristophanes:—  
*Au.* (870), 160  
*Pax* (1071 schol. on), 51; (1270 schol. on), 42  
*Ran.* (1078 *sqq.*), 163 f.  
*Thesm.* (504), 149  
Aristotélē:—  
*Gen. An.* (722<sup>a</sup> 5), 282  
*Hist. An.* (562<sup>a</sup> 25), 146  
*Nic. Eth.* (1110<sup>a</sup> 19, 30: 1110<sup>b</sup> 3), 104  
*Pol.* (1276<sup>b</sup> 1), 92 f., 97; viii. 7. 9), 98  
[*Problem.*] xix. (3. 4), 86: (20), 88, 91: (25:  
36: 44), 88: (47), 86 f.  
*Rhet.* ii. (23. 18), 170 (and n.)  
Aristoxenus:—  
*de Re Musica* i. (6 coll. ii. 40. 6), 98; ii. (37),  
94: (46), 91 f.

### B.

- Bacchylides:—  
*Od.* v. (121 *sq.*), 142; x. (120), *ib.*: xvi.  
(53), *ib.*

### C.

- C. C. A. G. V. iii. (pp. 100 *sq.*), 21  
Caesar:—  
*Bell. Ciu.* ii. (23-44), 135  
Callimachus:—  
*Epigr.* xxii. (Wilam.), 183  
Callinus i. (15), 142  
Catullus i. (8 *sq.*), 128; ii. (9), 122 ff.; viii. (15),  
125; xxv. (5), 126; xxix. (19 *sqq.*), 126 ff.; lxi.  
(119), 128; xcvi. (3 *sq.*), *ib.*

### Cicero:—

- ad Att.* xv. (4. 1), 26; xvi. (6. 1), 273 ff.:  
(11. 4), 35 (n.)  
*ad Fam.* vii. (12. 1), 273: (20. 1), 273, 276 ff.,  
281  
*de Div.* (91: 98), 111  
*de Legg.* ii. (9. 22), 286  
*de Orat.* i. (46. 202 coll. 242: 59. 251), 55;  
iii. (137), 35  
*Part. Or.* (22), 127  
*Tusc. Disp.* i. (18), 93 (n.): (77), 69  
Claudian:—  
*de Rapt. Pres.* iii. (81), 195  
Clement of Alexandria:—  
*Strom.* i. (21), 42 f.: (131), 44; vi. (2. 25. 1),  
233  
Ctesias:—  
*Persica* (xiv. 63 ed. Gilmore), 199

### D.

- Demosthenes:—  
*Epitaph.* (29), 47  
*Oratt.* i. (21), 136; xxiv. (39: 63), 147  
Dio Prusias ii. (45), 35  
Diodorus Siculus xi. (68 coll. Liu. ii. 56, 58), 68:  
(71. 4) 198: (71. 6), 250: (74. 2), 198: (75. 2),  
200  
Diogenes Laertius i. (2. 48), 39: (2. 56), 34, 39,  
134

### E.

- Empedocles:—  
*Katapual* (380 *sq.*), 193  
Ennius:—  
*fr.* (501 coll. Liu. v. 40. 2), 68  
Ephorus ap. Strab. (482), 35  
Euripides:—  
*Bacch.* (292), 214; (353), 158  
*Hel.* (33 *sq.*, 1136), 194  
*Herc. Fur.* (495), 214  
*Hippol.* (952 *sqq.*), 166 f. (and nn.)  
*I. A.* (248), 47  
*I. T.* (1262 *sqq.*), 174 (n.)  
*Med.* (1224 *sqq.*), 66  
*Phoen.* (202-213), 69



F.

Festus (140 Thewrewk) [=153 Müller] l. 30, 115 f.; (250 Th.=206 M. l. 25; 274 Th.=218 M. l. 28; 292 Th.=233 M. l. 1; 298 Th.=234 M. l. 15; 312 Th.=242 M. l. 28), 116; (326 Th.=249 M. l. 24; 334 Th.=253 M. l. 29; 342 Th.=257 M. lemma; 372 Th.=273 M. l. 10), 117; (378 Th.=274 M. l. 27), 117 fr.; (420 Th.=297 M. l. 2; 422 Th.=297 M. ll. 13, 23; 432 Th.=302 M. lemma), 118; (454 Th.=314 M. l. 4; 494 Th.=333 M.), 119  
F. H. G. ii. 210 (Heraclides' Πολυκλείας), 35

G.

Galen xix. (134). 197  
Germanicus:—  
*Phaen.* (558 sqq.), 109; (965 sq.), 286

H.

Heraclides Ponticus ap. Athen. xiv. (624 C), 84 f.  
Herodotus iv. (15), 44; v. (67), 34, 65; (94), 46; vii. (6), 106. 1), 253; (161), 46; viii. (128), 257  
Hesiod:—  
*Op. et Di.* (169, 169 a-d: 171: 172-3), 219 f.; (174-5), 220; (544), 197  
*Theog.* (71, 501-2), 220; (607 sq.), 147  
Homer:—

*Iliad* ii. (552 sqq.), 46; (558), 38 f., 50; (573), 39; (748), 47 (n.); iii. (230 schol. A on), 39; vi. (490 sqq. coll. *Od.* i. 356 sqq., xxi. 350 sqq.) 241; ix. (108), 130; x. init. (schol. T on), 40; xi. (126 sq.), 139; (720 coll. *Od.* x. 525), 240; xiii. (257), 131; xv. (224 coll. 228), 129; xvi. (244), 10; xxi. (60), 10; xxiii. (103), 193  
*Odyssey* i. (398 coll. *Il.* xviii. 28), 235; iii. (245 coll. *Il.* i. 250 sqq.), 10; (291 coll. *Il.* xxi. 3), 10; iv. (527), 235 f.; (829 coll. *Il.* xi. 201), 236; vi. (185), 213; vii. (197 coll. *Il.* xx. 127), 236; viii. (258 coll. *Il.* vii. 161), 236 f.; ix. (330 coll. *Il.* viii. 355), 10; x. (162 coll. *Il.* xvi. 396), 237; 334), 129; (495), 193; xi. (166 sq.), 129; (481, 562), 130; (601 sqq.), 144; (602 sqq.), 40, 46; (631), 40, 50; xiii. (5 coll. *Il.* i. 59, 237; xiv. (156 coll. *Il.* ix. 312), 10; (419 coll. *Il.* ii. 402), 237 f.; xv. (161 coll. *Il.* xii. 201 sq., 240; (479), 238; xvi. (44 sq.) 130; xvii. (541 coll. *Il.* ii. 334), 240 f.; xix. (344), 129; xxi. (125 coll. *Il.* xxi. 176), 238; (335 coll. *Il.* xiv. 113), 10; xxii. (73), 236; (233 coll. *Il.* xi. 314), 238; (296 coll. *Il.* xii. 396 sqq.), 238 f.; (308 sq. coll. *Il.* xxi. 20 sq.), 239; (494 coll. *Il.* vi. 316), 10; xxiii. (297-xxiv. fin.), 231 ff.

Horace:—

*A. P.* (114), 208; (172), 106  
*Carm.* I. vi. (1), 106 f.; xii. (33 sqq.), 107; (50), 109 (n.); xiv., 139; xv. (15), 106; xxxiv., 284; xxvii. (19), 213; xxviii. (31),

Horace:—continued.

141; III. iv. (37), 107 f.; v. (37), 108; xiv. (1), 105 f.; xxiv. (3 sq.), 57; xxx. (10 sqq.), 105  
*Sat.* I. iv. (72), 142

I.

Isaeus xi. (21), 250  
Isidore:—  
*Etym.* II. xxi. (43), 141; XII. i. (26), 196; XIX. xxvii. (12), 196 (n.)  
Isocrates:  
*de Pace* (86), 198  
*Paneg.* (42. 159), 33 f.

J.

Julian:—  
*Ep.* (59), 140  
Julius Africanus:—  
*Keerol* (49), 262; (50), 261; (52), 263; (53), 261  
Juvenal iii. (147 sqq.), 196 f.; (151 schol. on), 196

L.

Livy iv. (61. 6), 69; viii. (8, 10), 26  
Lucan:—  
*Pharsalia* i. (429), 141; vi. (337 sq.), 213 f.  
Lucretius i. (112 sqq.), 190 f.; (951 sqq.), 142; (804), 10.  
Lycurgus:—  
*in Leocr.* (pp. 102), 33

M.

Macrobius:—  
*Saturn.* i. (1. 5 sq.), 213  
Manilius ii. (631), 20 (n.); (507 sqq.), 109; iii. (486 sq.), 32; (496), 10; iv. (547 sqq.), 110 ff.; (773 sqq.), 112 ff.  
Martial:—  
*Epigr.* V. lxxviii. (31), 68  
Minucius Felix:—  
*Oct.* (23. 6), 214

O.

Ovid:—  
*Fast.* iii. (587), 196 (n.)  
*Met.* iv. (276), 182 (n.); xiii. (923), 196 (n.)  
*Trist.* ii. (415), 213  
Oxyrhynchus Papyri (412), 40; viii. p. 35 (fr. 2. col. ii. 6), 66

P.

Pausanias vii. (26. 13), 35 f., 39  
Persius (prol. 1 sqq. and schol.), 191 f.; i. (5-12), 12 ff.; (22 sq.), 14 f.; ii. (31-37), 15; (52-58), 15 f.; iii. (1-62), 16 ff.; (12-14), 18; (78), 31; iv. (46), 10; v. (41-51 coll. Hor. *Carm.* II. xvii. 15-24), 18 ff.; (60 sq.), 21 f.; (64-69), 22 f.

Persius:—*continued.*

(73-76), 23 f. : (109-112), 24 : (134-137), 24 f. ;  
vi. (6-8), 25 ff. : (9 *sqq.*), 192 : (37-40), 27 f. :  
(41-56), 29 f. : (64-69), 30 f. : (75-80), 31 f.

## Petronius:—

*Cen. Trimalch.* (38. 2), 203

## Pindar:—

*Pyth.* iv. (250), 71

## Plato:—

*Gorg.* (467 C), 253  
[*Hipparch.*] (228 B), 34  
*Laws* (665 D), 92, 97  
*Lysis* (208 E), 104  
*Menex.* (237 A), 104  
*Phaedo* (69 A), 104 ; (85 B), 160 ; (93 D), 154 ;  
(98 E), 162 f.  
*Phaedr.* (254 D), 154 ; (273 A), 250  
*Phil.* (17), 92, 97  
*Rep.* (412 D), 268 ; (430 D—432 A), 265 f. ;  
(431 E, 433 C), 269 ; (435-441), 271 f. ;  
(436 A, B), 270  
*Soph.* (244 C), 52 f.  
*Theaet.* (168 C),

## Plautus:

*Aul.* (408), 205 ; (737a), 115 f.  
*Bauch.* (52), 6 ; (107), 1 f., 120 f.  
*Cist.* (287), 6  
*Cure.* (367), 117 f. ; (578), 205  
*Epid.* (10, 353), 8  
*Men.* (31), 7 ; (1021), 213  
*Merc.* (985), 144  
*Pers.* (392), 118  
*Poen.* (969, 1317), 2  
*Pseud.* (263), 7 ; (997), 9 ; (1276), 8  
*Stich.* (339), 5  
*Truc.* (prol. 1 *sqq.*), 4 f. ; (180 *sq.*), 2 ; (273), 5

## Pliny:—

*Nat. Hist.* iii. (95), 68

## Plutarch:—

*de Musica* (23), 87 (and n.); (1137 D), 95 ff. ;  
(1136 E), 97 ; (1137 D), 95 ff.  
*Lucull.* (21), 154  
*Lycurg.* (4), 35  
*Romul.* (12), 44  
*Theb.* (10. 20), 50

## Pollux iii. (152), 149

Propertius III. iii. (1 *sqq.*), 190 f. ; IV. i. (124), 25 ;  
iv. (55), 285

## S.

## Sallust:—

*Jug.* (13. 9—15. 2), 68

## Seneca:—

*Ep. Mor.* xv. (9), 55 ; xxi. (10), 56 ; xl. (10),  
*id.* ; lxxx. (1), *id.* ; cviii. (1, 3, 10), *id.*

Silius Italicus xiv. (462 *sqq.*), 182 (n.)

Solinus i. (18), 111

## Sophocles:—

*Ant.* (185), 104  
*El.* (585), 104  
O. C. (390 schol. on), 151

## Statius:—

*Theb.* ii. (376 *sq.*), 25 f.

Strabo (344), 38, 50 ; (647), 44

## Suetonius:—

*Aug.* (5), 110 f. ; (94), 109, 110 (n.)

*Calig.* (16. 4), 113

*Tib.* (5), 113

## T.

## Tacitus:

*Agr.* (27. 5), 68

*Ann.* vi. (22), 142 ; xv. (5), 69

## Terence:—

*Andr.* (395), 213

## Theocritus:—

*Epigr.* xiii. (Wilamowitz), 176

*Idyll.* i. (139 *sq.*), 176 ff. ; xxii. (115 Paley),  
128

Thucydides-i. (3. 2), 153 f. : (9. 3 : 10. 4 : 11. 2),  
154 : (12. 3), 145 : (17. 23. 6 : 25. 1, 4), 154 ;  
(28. 5), 145 : (35. 5 : 36. 3 : 37. 2 : 38. 4 : 40. 6),  
154 : (63. 1, 2 : 69. 4, 6 : 70. 5), 155 : (77. 3 :  
78. 4), 145 : (84. 4 : 89. 2 : 91. 6 : 93. 2 : 95. 7),  
155 : (104), 198 : (115. 4), 155 : (120. 1), 145 ;  
(122. 3 : 124. 3 : 125. 2), 155 : (126. 6), 145 ;  
(128. 1), 155 : (128. 5), 145 f. : (132. 5), 155 ;  
(133), 156, 244 : (136. 4), 146 : (141. 1, 4, 7 :  
142. 3 : 143. 2), 156

ii. (4. 2 : 7. 2 : 11. 3 : 13. 9 : 16. 1), 243 ;  
(17. 3 : 22. 3 : 26. 1 : 37. 1, 3 : 39. 4 : 40. 2, 3),  
244 : (41. 4), 245 : (44. 1), 147, 245 : (47. 3 :  
48. 3 : 49. 5 : 7 : 53. 3 : 62. 1 : 65. 2), 245 ;  
(65. 10), 146 : (72. 1 : 74. 2), 245 : (76. 4 : 77. 4),  
146 : (80. 1 : 84. 2), 245 : (87. 3), 246 : (89. 2),  
146 : (89. 5 : 90. 1, 2, 3), 246 : (90. 6), 146 ;  
(94. 1), 246 : (96. 3 : 100. 2 : 102. 4), 146

iii. (4. 4 : 11. 4), 246 : (11. 6 : 12. 1), 146 ;  
(26. 4), 246 : (30. 4), 246 f. : (34. 3 : 38. 1, 5, 6 :  
39. 6), 247 : (39. 8), 146 : (44. 2), 247 : (45. 4),  
146 : (45. 7 : 47. 5 : 51. 2), 247 : (51. 4), 146 ;  
(52. 2, 4 : 55. 3), 247 : (58. 5, 247 f. : (63. 2 :  
65. 3 : 66. 3 : 67. 68. 1 : 75. 4), 248 : (80. 1), 146 ;  
(81. 2), 147 : (81. 5), 248 f. : (82. 3, 4), 249 : (82.  
7), 147, 249 : (82. 8 : 84. 1 : 91. 3), 249 : (92. 5),  
147 : (93. 2 : 97. 2 : 98. 4 : 102. 3), 249 : (104.  
6 coll. 108. 2 : 111. 2), 147 : (113. 4), 249 ;  
(114. 4), 249 f.

iv. (4. 1), 147 : (8. 7 : 9. 2 : 10. 3, 5 : 14. 3 :  
16. 1), 250 : (17. 1), 147 : (17. 3), 251 : (18. 4),  
147 : (19. 2, 4 : 20. 2), 251 : (22. 2), 147 : (30. 2,  
4 : 32. 1, 3, 4 : 34. 1), 251 : (36. 3 : 40. 2 : 41. 3),  
252 : (41. 4), 147 : (44. 5), 147 f. : (50. 1 : 55. 1,  
2), 252 : (56. 1), 148 : (65. 3), 252 : (65. 4 :  
67. 3 : 71. 2), 253 : (72. 4 : 73. 2), 148 : (73. 4 :  
78. 2 : 81. 1 : 84. 2 : 85. 2), 253 : (85. 4), 148 ;  
(85. 7), 253 : (86. 5 : 87. 2), 254 : (87. 4, 5 :  
90. 1), 128 : (92. 1) : 254 : (92. 3), 148 : (92. 7),  
254 : (93. 2). 148 : (94. 1 : 96. 3 : 98. 8 : 102.  
4, 5), 254 : (105. 1), 148 : (108. 6), 148 f. : (113.  
149 : (117. 2), 254 : (118. 3), 149 : (118. 5), 254 ;  
(118. 11), 255 : (119. 1, 3), 149 : (120. 1), 149 f. :

Thucydides:—*continued*.

(120. 3 : 122. 2 : 126. 2), 150 : (128. 5), 150 f. :  
(132. 2 : 133. 3), 255  
v. (5. 1 : 10. 7 : 41. 2 : 44. 1), 157  
vi. (24. 1 : 25. 2 : 62. 1 : 64. 1, 3), 152  
vii. (26. 2 : 39. 2 : 41. 2 : 69. 2 : 75. 3), 152  
viii. (44. 1 : 45. 4), 152 : (66. 4 : 68. 4 : 99. 1 :  
101. 2, 3), 153

Tibullus IV. vi. [III. xii.] (19 sq.), 141 : x.  
[III. xvi.] (1 sq., 5 sq.), *ib.*

V.

Valerius Flaccus:—

*Argonautica* iv. (386 sq.), 195

Valerius Maximus iv. (3. 4), 69

Venantius Fortunatus:—

*Carm.* vi. (5. 168), 3

Virgil:—

*Aen.* ii. (274), 192 : v. (722 sq.), 194 : (731 sqq.),  
195 : vi. (283), 232 : (785 sqq.), 54 : vii.  
(101), 214 : ix. (160 sqq., 229), 140 : x. (636  
sq.), 195 : xi. (503), 140  
[*Catalept.*] (ii. 2 sqq.), 286 : (x. 23), *ib.*  
(xiv. 9), *ib.*  
*Ed.* iv. (61), 140 : vi. (64 sqq.), 189

X.

Xenophanes:—

*fr.* 5 (Karsten), 139

Xenophon:—

*Hell.* iii. (2. 20), 243 : (5. 1), 247 : v. (2. 18),  
153  
*Cyrop.* vii. (5. 37), 244  
*Mem.* iii. (11), 142



παραιεῖν = δθερεῖν, 39  
 πασσυδέι, 72  
 παεῖν and σκοπεῖν interchanged, 254  
 Ποσειδώνιος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς (Suid.), 142

Σ.

σ and θ, confusion between, 246  
 -σθ- (N.W. dialects), 144  
 σφανίον (Hesych.), 72  
 σοφία (Plat.), 268  
 σφηνόπους, 72  
 σχολαστικὸς φόρου Θηβαῖδος (pap.), 141  
 σωφροσύνη ἀλόγιστος (Plat.), 265

T.

ταῦτα (inscr.), 288  
 τεχνάζειν (Aen. Tact.), 257 f.  
 τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἐπλετο μῦθος, 238 f.

T.

-υλος, names in, 38  
 θυμῶν, 71

Φ.

φθορεῖα or φθορεῖα (?), 68  
 φιλόσοφος (Plat.), 267

X.

χάρις, 256  
 χέρος, 72

Ψ.

ψυχαγωγεῖν, 160

Ω.

ὦτ and καί, confusion between, 152, 154, 155,  
 253, 254  
 ὦσπερ repeated (?), 148

B.—LATIN.

A.

a and u, confusion between, 123  
 absque, 213  
 actor, 58  
 adhibuisti (metr.), 2  
 amentare (amentatus), 55  
 amnis (gend.), 117  
 ancus (ancilla), 69  
 annis (Ter.), 116  
 armifer, 144  
 ascia (ἀξίω), 205  
 auditito (?), 5  
 axamenta (στρίχον), 204 f.  
 axitas, 205  
 axitia ('paint-stick'), 205 f.  
 axitiatus, 204 f.

B.

benignus, 144

C.

cachinno, 13  
 caelebs (of women), 125  
 caput obnubilo, 206  
 cil, 127  
 -cola ('drover'), 204  
 collucare, 26  
 collus (masc.), 117  
 commarcere, 26  
 concalere, ib.  
 tconcyli, 37 f.  
 condolere, 26  
 conferuere, ib.  
 conticere, ib.  
 culanit, 203 f.  
 culina (2), 283

D.

dice and dic, 6  
 diues, 72

E.

-ē and -is (Plaut.), 118  
 elogium, 69  
 em, 116  
 epitoncylo, 37 (and n.)  
 -cucus, the suffix, 72  
 exardere, 26  
 exardere, ib.  
 exhorre, ib.  
 extra oleas latus, 213

F.

focnus = funus (Luc.), 141  
 forsit, ib.  
 fuisse, fuisti (metr.), 2

G.

gloria, 249

H.

haud secus quam, 26  
 hora = horoscopus (?), 20 (and n.)  
 horreum, 72

I.

-igo, -ago, -ugo, 72  
 illucere, 26  
 impluere (+ acc.), 4  
 in-, compounds of, 4, 26  
 inalbere, 26  
 inferuere, ib.  
 inflaccare, ib.  
 inhorre, ib.  
 instupere, ib.  
 intepere, ib.  
 inualere, ib.  
 iocari, 123 (and n.)  
 inuenticula (senecta), 144

- L.**  
*l* and *t*, confusion between (?), 125  
*linum*, 196 f.  
*lotus* (gend.), 276 f.  
*ludus*, 69  
*Lunai portus*, 192
- M.**  
*maluisti* (metr.), 2  
*māmus*, *māmercus*, etc., 72
- N.**  
*n̄* and *in*, confusion between, 25  
*ne* 'affirmantis' + pers. pron., 125  
*nebula* ('bridal veil'), 206  
*niger*, 69  
*noster* = *propitius*, 20  
*nubere*, 206 f.  
*nupsit*(*obnubis*), 207
- O.**  
*obnubere*, 206  
*otii* = *uiare* = *voyager*, 202  
*oplare*, 144
- P.**  
*pane* (*panem*), 117 f.  
*parabola*, 144  
*pater* (metr.), 7  
*penitus*, 6
- per omnia elementa* (Apul.), 141  
*pietas* (metr.), 7  
*plelius* (*plenius*), 118  
*plusscia* (Petron.), 144  
*praedam circ*, 127  
*purgare*, 144
- Q.**  
*quia*, 144  
*quod* (conditional), 213
- R.**  
*receptuis* (?), 116  
*rete* (*retia*), 117  
*ruga*, 31 f.
- S.**  
*sarta* ('tag' of bootlace), 197  
*senecta aetas* (Plaut.), 144  
*seu* (*sine*) . . . *vel si*, 20
- T.**  
*tantum*, 288  
*tunica lintea*, 196 f.  
*turba*, 1 f., 120 f.
- V.**  
*vel* . . . *sen*, 19 f.  
*vescor*, 203  
*-(u)lentus*, the suffix, 72  
*utor*, 202 f.

cholar of